

MANETHO

WITH AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION BY

W. G. WADDELL

PROFESSOR OF CLASSICS IN FUAD EL AWAL UNIVERSITY.
CAIRO, EGYPT



CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON
WILLIAM HEINEMANN LTD.

MCMLXIV

INTRODUCTION

AMONG the Egyptians who wrote in Greek. Manetho the priest holds a unique place because of his comparatively early date (the third century B.C.) and the interest of his subject-matter—the history and religion of Ancient Egypt. His works in their original form would possess the highest importance and value for us now, if only we could recover them; but until the fortunate discovery of a papyrus,¹ which will transmit the authentic Manetho, we can know his writings only from fragmentary and often distorted quotations preserved chiefly by Josephus and by the Christian chronographers, Africanus and Eusebius, with isolated passages in Plutarch, Theophilus, Aelian, Porphyrius, Diogenes Laertius, Theodoretus, Lydus, Malalas, the Scholia to Plato, and the *Etymologicum Magnum*.

Like Bêrôssos, who is of slightly earlier date, Manetho testifies to the growth of an international

¹ F. Bilabel (in P. Baden 4. 1924, No. 59: see also *Die Kleine Historiker*, Fragn. 11) published a papyrus of the fifth century after Christ containing a list of Persian kings with the years of their reigns (see further Fr. 70, note 1), and holds it to be, not part of the original *Epitome*, but a version made from it before the time of Africanus. It certainly proves that Egyptians were interested in Greek versions of the Kings' Lists, and much more so, presumably, in the unabridged Manetho. See Fr. 2 for Panodôrus and Annianus, who were monks in Egypt about the date of this papyrus. Cf. also P. Hibeh, i. 27, the Calendar of Saïs, translated into Greek in the reign of Ptolemy Sôter, i.e. early in the lifetime of Manetho.

MANETHO

spirit in the Alexandrine age: each of these "barbarians" wrote in Greek an account of his native country; and it stirs the imagination to think of their endeavour to bridge the gulf and instruct all Greek-speaking people (that is to say the whole civilized world of their time) in the history of Egypt and Chaldaea. But these two writers stand alone: ¹ the Greeks indeed wrote from time to time of the wonders of Egypt (works no longer extant), but it was long before an Egyptian successor of Manetho appeared—Ptolemy of Mendês,² probably under Augustus.

The writings of Manetho, however, continued to

¹ Cf. W. W. Tarn on Ptolemy II. in the *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 1928, xiv. p. 254: (Activity at Alexandria had no effect at all on Egyptians) "Ptolemy Sôter had thought for a moment that Egyptians might participate in the intellectual activities of Alexandria: . . . but, though Manetho dedicated his work to Ptolemy II., in this reign all interest in native Egypt was dropped, and a little later Alexandria appears as merely an object of hatred to many Egyptians. (Its destruction is prophesied in the Potter's Oracle.)" (See p. 123 n. 1.)

The complete isolation of Manetho and Bêrôssos is the chief argument of Ernest Havet against the authenticity of these writers (*Mémoire sur les écrits qui portent les noms de Bêrose et de Manéthon*, Paris, 1873). He regards the double tradition as curious and extraordinary—there is no other name to set beside these two Oriental priests; and he suspects the symmetry of the tradition—each wrote three books for a king. Cf. Croiset, *Histoire de la Littérature Grecque*, v. p. 99; *Abridged History of Greek Literature*, English translation, p. 429 (Manetho's works were probably written by a Hellenized Oriental at the end of the second century B.C.); and F. A. Wright, *Later Greek Literature*, p. 60.

² See p. x.

INTRODUCTION

be read with interest ; and his *Egyptian History* was used for special purposes, e.g. by the Jews when they engaged in polemic against Egyptians in order to prove their extreme antiquity. (See further pp. xvi ff.) Manetho's religious writings are known to us mainly through references in Plutarch's treatise *On Isis and Osiris*.

The Life of Manetho : Traditions and Conjectures.

Our knowledge of Manetho is for the most part meagre and uncertain ; but three statements of great probability may be made. They concern his native place, his priesthood at Héliopolis, and his activity in the introduction of the cult of Serapis.

The name Manetho (*Μανεθώς*, often written *Μανεθων*) has been explained as meaning "Truth of Thôth", and a certain priest under Dynasty XIX. is described as "First Priest of the Truth of Thôth".¹ According to Dr. Černý² "Manetho" is from the Coptic *MANEETO* "groom" (*MANE* "herdsman", and *ETO* "horse"); but the word does not seem to occur elsewhere as a proper name. In regard to the date of Manetho, Syncellus in one passage³ gives us the information that he lived later than Bêrôssos : elsewhere⁴ he puts Manetho as "almost contemporary with Bêrôssos, or a little later". Bêrôssos, who

¹ W. Spiegelberg, *Orient. Literaturz.* xxxi. 1928, col. 145 ff., xxxii. 1929, col. 321 f. Older explanations of the name Manetho were "Gift of Thôth," "Beloved of Thôth," and "Beloved of Neith".

² In the centenary volume of the Vatican Museum : I owe this reference to the kindness of Dr. Alan H. Gardiner.

³ Manetho, Fr. 3.

⁴ Syncellus, p. 26.

MANETHO

was priest of Marduk at Babylon, lived under, and wrote for, Antiochus I. whose reign lasted from 285 to 261 B.C.; and Bêrôssos dedicated his *Χαλδαϊκά* to this king after he became sole monarch in 281 B.C. The works of Manetho and Bêrôssos may be interpreted as an expression of the rivalry of the two kings, Ptolemy and Antiochus, each seeking to proclaim the great antiquity of his land.

Under the name of Manetho, Suidas seems to distinguish two writers: (1) Manetho of Mendês in Egypt, a chief priest who wrote on the making of *kyphi* (i.e. Fr. 87): (2) Manetho of Diospolis or Sebennytus. (Works): *A Treatise on Physical Doctrines* (i.e. Fr. 82, 83). *Apotelesmatica* (or *Astrological Influences*), in hexameter verses, and other astrological works. (See p. xiv, note 3.) Nowhere else is Manetho connected with Mendês; but as Mendês was distant only about 17 miles from Sebennytus across the Damietta arm of the Nile, the attribution is not impossible. Müller suspects confusion with Ptolemy of Mendês, an Egyptian priest (probably in the time of Augustus), who, like Manetho, wrote a work on Egyptian Chronology in three books. In the second note of Suidas Diospolis may be identified, not with Diospolis Magna (the famous Thebes) nor with Diospolis Parva, but with Diospolis Inferior, in the Delta (now Tell el-Balamûn), the capital of the Diospolite or 17th nome¹ to the north of the Sebennyte nome and contiguous with

¹ The Greek word *νομός* means a division of Egypt, called in Ancient Egyptian *sp.t*,—a district corresponding roughly to a county in England. Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 5, 9) refers to nomes as *præfecturae oppidorum*.

INTRODUCTION

it. Diospolis Inferior lay near Damietta, some 30 miles from Sebennytus. (See Strabo, 17. 1, 19, and Baedeker, *Egypt and the Sûdân*, 8th ed. (1929), p. 185.) We may therefore accept the usual description of Manetho (Fr. 3, 77, 80: Syncellus, 72, 16), and hold that he was a native of Sebennytus (now Samannûd)¹ in the Delta, on the west bank of the Damietta branch of the Nile. Manetho was a priest, and doubtless held office at one time in the temple at Sebennytus; but in the letter (App. I.) which he is said to have written to Ptolemy II. Philadelphus, he describes himself as "high-priest and scribe of the sacred shrines of Egypt, born at Sebennytus and dwelling at Héliopolis". Although the letter, as we have it, is not genuine in all its details, this description may have been borrowed from a good source; and while his precise rank as a priest remains in doubt, it is reasonable to believe that Manetho rose to be high-priest in the temple at Héliopolis.² This eminent position agrees with the important part he played in the introduction of the cult of Serapis. As a Heliopolitan priest, Manetho (to quote from Laqueur, Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *R.-E.* xiv. 1, 1061) "was, without doubt, acquainted with

¹ See Baedeker⁸, p. 185. Sebennytus was the seat of Dynasty XXX., and therefore a place of great importance shortly before the time of Manetho. In Ancient Egyptian, Sebennytus is *Tjeb-nûter*, "city of the sacred calf": it is tempting to connect with Sebennytus the worship of the Golden Calf in *O.T. Exodus xxxii.*, *1 Kings xii.* 28 ff. (P. E. Newberry).

² See Strabo, 17. 1, 29 for the "large houses in which the priests had lived". According to Herodotus (ii. 3, 1), "the Heliopolitans are said to be the most learned of the Egyptians".

MANETHO

the sacred tree in the great Hall of Héliopolis,—the tree on which the goddess Seshat, the Lady of Letters, the Mistress of the Library, wrote down with her own hand the names and deeds of the rulers.¹ He did nothing more than communicate to the Greek world what the goddess had noted down.² But he did so with a full sense of the superiority which relied on the sacred records of the Egyptians in opposition to Herodotus whom he was contradicting" (Fr. 43, § 73: Fr. 88). His native town, Sebennytus, was visited as a place of learning by Solon when Ethêmôn was a priest in residence there (see Proclus in *Plat. Tim.* i. 101, 22, Diehl); and the Greek culture of the place must have been a formative influence upon Manetho at an early age.

In the introduction of the statue of Serapis to Alexandria as described by Plutarch (Manetho, Fr. 80), Manetho the Egyptian was associated with the Greek Timotheus as a priestly adviser of King Ptolemy Sôter. It is natural to suppose that the cult of Serapis itself, which was a conflation of

¹ See Erman-Ranke, *Ägypten*, 1923, pp. 396 f.; or Erman, *Die Religion der Ägypter*, 1934, pp. 56 f.; or the original drawing in Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, iii. 169. This illustration shows the goddess, along with Thôth and Atûm, making inscriptions upon the leaves (or fruit) of the venerable tree.

² It may be added that the Egyptians are surpassed by no nation in their strong and ever-present desire to leave upon stone or papyrus permanent records of their history, their motive being to glorify the ruling king. Cf. Herodotus, ii. 77, 1 (of the Egyptians who live in the cultivated country), "the most diligent of all men in preserving the memory of the past, and far better skilled in chronicles than any others whom I have questioned".

INTRODUCTION

Egyptian and Greek ideas intended to be acceptable to both nationalities, had already been organized¹ with the help of the two priests, and the magnificent temple in Rhakôtis, the Egyptian quarter in the west of Alexandria, had doubtless been built. The date is not certain : according to Jerome (Fotheringham, p. 211, Helm, p. 129) " Sarapis entered Alexandria " in 286 B.C., while the Armenian Version of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius says that in 278 B.C. " Sarapis came to Alexandria, and became resident there " (Karst, 200). Perhaps the two statements refer to different stages in the development of the cult : if the former describes the entry of the statue by Bryaxis, the latter may possibly refer to the final establishment of the whole theology. As a proof that the work of Manetho in building up the cult of Serapis must not be belittled, it may suffice to refer to the inscription of the name *Μαρέθων* on the base of a marble bust found in the ruins of the Temple of Serapis at Carthage (*Corpus Inscr. Lat.* viii. 1007). The name is so uncommon that the probability is that the bust which originally stood on this base represented the Egyptian Manetho, and was erected in his honour because of his effective contribution to the organization of the cult of

¹ The earliest date for Serapis is given by Macrobius, *Sat.* i. 20, 16, a questioning of Serapis by Nicocreon of Cyprus, c. 311-310 B.C. For Dittenberger, *O.G.I.S.* 16 (an inscription from Halicarnassus on the founding of a temple to Serapis-Isis under (the satrap) Ptolemy Sôter), the date is uncertain, probably c. 308-306 B.C. Already in Menander's drama, *Ἐγχειρίδιον* (before 291 B.C. when Menander died), Serapis is a " holy god " (P. Oxy. XV. 1803).

MANETHO

Serapis.¹ Hence it is not impossible also that the following reference in a papyrus of 241 B.C. may be to Manetho of Sebennytus. It occurs in a document containing correspondence about a Temple Seal (P. Hibeh, i. 72, vv. 6, 7, γράφειν Μανεθῶι). The person named was evidently a well-known man in priestly circles : he was probably our Manetho, the writer on Egyptian history and religion, if he lived to a considerable age.²

Manetho's Works.

Eight works³ have been attributed to Manetho : (1) *Αἰγυπτιακά*, or *The History of Egypt*, (2) *The Book of Sôthis*, (3) *The Sacred Book*, (4) *An Epitome of Physical Doctrines*, (5) *On Festivals*, (6) *On Ancient Ritual and Religion*, (7) *On the Making of Kyphi* [a kind of incense], (8) *Criticisms of Herodotus*.

Of these, (2) *The Book of Sôthis* (App. IV. and

¹ Cf. Lafaye, *Histoire du Culte des Divinités d'Alexandrie* (1884), p. 16 n. 1 : "At all events, there is no doubt that the adepts of the Alexandrine cult had great veneration for Manetho, and considered him in some measure as their patriarch".

² Bouché-Leclercq (*Histoire des Lagides*, iv. p. 269 n. 4) holds a different opinion : "the reference is not necessarily to the celebrated Manetho, whose very existence is problematical".

³ A work wrongly attributed in antiquity (e.g. by Suidas, see p. x) to Manetho of Sebennytus is *Ἀποτελεσματικά*, in 6 books, an astrological poem in hexameters on the influence of the stars. See W. Kroll (*R.-E. s.v. Manethon* (2)), who with Köchly recognizes in the 6 books 4 sections of different dates from about A.D. 120 to the fourth century after Christ. Books I. and V. open with dedications to King Ptolemy : cf. Pseudo-Manetho, Appendix I.

INTRODUCTION

pp. xxvii. ff.) is certainly not by Manetho ; and there is no reason to believe that (8) *Criticisms of Herodotus* formed a separate work, although we know from Josephus, *C. Apion.* i. 73 (Fr. 42), that Manetho did convict Herodotus of error. Six titles remain, but it has long been thought that some of these are "ghost" titles. Fruin (*Manetho*, p. lxxvii) supposed that Manetho wrote only two works—one on Egyptian history, the other on Egyptian mythology and antiquities. Susemihl (*Alex. Lit.-Gesch.* i. 609, n. 431) and W. Otto (*Priester und Tempel in Hellenistischen Ägypten*, ii. 215, n. 4) modified this extreme view : they recognized three distinct works of Manetho (*The History of Egypt*, *The Sacred Book*, and *An Epitome of Physical Doctrines*), and assumed that the titles *On Festivals*, *On Ancient Ritual and Religion*, and *On the Making of Kyphi* referred to passages in *The Sacred Book*. In the paucity of our data, no definite judgement seems possible as to whether Manetho wrote six works or only three ; but in support of the former theory we may refer to Eusebius (Man. Fr. 76).

The History of Egypt.

The *Egyptian History* ¹ of Manetho is preserved in extracts of two kinds. (1) Excerpts from the original work are preserved by Josephus, along with other passages which can only be pseudo-

¹ Or *Notes about Egypt*. There are two variants of the Greek title : *Αἰγυπτιακά* (Josephus in Fr. 42), and *Αἰγυπτιακά ὑπομνήματα* (*Aegyptiaca monumenta*, Eus. in Fr. 1), with a possible third form *Αἰγυπτίων ὑπομνήματα* (*Aegyptiorum monumenta*, Eus., p. 359).

MANETHO

Manethonian. The Jews of the three centuries following the time of Manetho were naturally keenly interested in his *History* because of the connexion of their ancestors with Egypt—Abraham, Joseph, and Moses the leader of the Exodus; and they sought to base their theories of the origin and antiquity of the Jews securely upon the authentic traditions of Egypt. In Manetho indeed they found an unwelcome statement of the descent of the Jews from lepers; but they were able to identify their ancestors with the Hyksôs, and the Exodus with the expulsion of these invaders. The efforts of Jewish apologists account for much re-handling, enlargement, and corruption of Manetho's text, and the result may be seen in the treatise of Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, i.

(2) An *Epitome* of Manetho's history had been made at an early date,—not by Manetho himself, there is reason to believe,—in the form of Lists of Dynasties with short notes on outstanding kings or important events. The remains of this *Epitome* are preserved by Christian chronographers, especially by Africanus and Eusebius. Their aim was to compare the chronologies of the Oriental nations with the Bible, and for this purpose the *Epitome* gave an ideal conspectus of the whole *History*, omitting, as it does, narratives such as the account of the Hyksôs preserved by Josephus. Of the two chronographers, the founder of Christian chronography, Sextus Julius Africanus, whose *Chronicle*¹ came down to

¹ For a later miscellaneous work, the *Κεστοί*, see P. Oxy. iii. 412 (between A.D. 225 and 265); and Jules Africain, *Fragments des Cestes*, ed. J.-R. Vieillefond, Paris, 1932.

INTRODUCTION

A.D. 217 or A.D. 221, transmits the *Epitome* in a more accurate form ; while Eusebius, whose work extends to A.D. 326, is responsible for unwarranted alterations of the original text of Manetho. About A.D. 800 George the Monk, who is known as Syncellus from his religious office (as “ attendant ” of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople), made use of Manetho’s work in various forms in his *Ἐκλογὴ Χρονογραφίας*, a history of the world from Adam to Diocletian. Syncellus sought to prove that the incarnation took place in Anno Mundi 5500 ; and in his survey of the thirty-one Egyptian dynasties which reigned from the Flood to Darius, he relied on the authoritative work of Manetho as transmitted by Africanus and Eusebius, and as handed down in a corrupt form in the *Old Chronicle* (App. III.) and the *Book of Sôthis* (App. IV.) which had been used by the chronographer Panodôrus (c. A.D. 400).

Even from the above brief statement of the transmission of Manetho’s text, it will be seen that many problems are involved, and that it is extremely difficult to reach certainty in regard to what is authentic Manetho and what is spurious or corrupt. The problems are discussed in detail by Richard Laqueur in his valuable and exhaustive article in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *R.-E. s.v. Manethon* ; and it may be sufficient here to quote his summary of the results of his researches in regard to Manetho (1) in Josephus, and (2) in the Christian Chronographers.

(1) Manetho in Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, i. (see Fr. 42, 50, 54.)

“(a) Extracts from the genuine Manetho appear in §§ 75-82, 84-90, 94-102a, 232-249, 251. Of these

MANETHO

passages, §§ 75-82, 94-102*a*, 237-249 are quoted *verbatim*, the others are given in Indirect Speech.

“(b) A rationalistic critique of the genuine Manetho was written by a Hellenist, and was used by Josephus for his work. The remains of this critique appear in §§ 254-261, 267-269, 271-274, 276-277. Perhaps §§ 102*b*-103 is connected with these.

“(c) The authoritative work of Manetho was further exploited by Jews and Egyptians in their mutual polemic, in the course of which additions to Manetho’s works were made : these additions were partly favourable to the Jews (§§ 83, 91), partly hostile to the Jews (§ 250). These passages, like those mentioned in (b), were collected before the time of Josephus into a single treatise, so that one could no longer clearly recognize what had belonged to Manetho and what was based upon additions.

“(d) Josephus originally knew only the genuine Manetho (*cf.* (a)), and used him throughout as a witness against the aggressors of Judaism. In this it was of importance for Josephus to show that the Hyksôs had come to Egypt from abroad, that their expulsion took place long before the beginning of Greek history, and that they, in their expedition to aid the Lepers, remained untainted by them.

“(e) After Josephus had completed this elaboration, he came later to know the material mentioned in (b) and (c) : so far as it was favourable to the Jews or helpful in interpretation, it led only to short expansions of the older presentation ; so far, however, as it was hostile to the Jews, Josephus found himself induced to make a radical change in his attitude towards Manetho. He attacked Manetho
xviii

INTRODUCTION

sharply for his alleged statement (§ 250), and at the same time used the polemic mentioned in (b) in order to overthrow Manetho's authority in general.

“(f) From the facts adduced it follows that Manetho's work was already before the time of Josephus the object of numerous literary analyses.”¹

Cf. the following summary.

(2) Manetho in the Christian Chronographers.

“(a) Not long after the appearance of Manetho's work, an *Epitome* was made, giving excerpts from the Dynasty-Lists and increasing these from 30 to 31. The possibility that other additions were made is not excluded.

“(b) The *Epitome* was remodelled by a Hellenistic Jew in such a way that the Jewish chronology became compatible with that of Manetho.

“(c) A descendant of version (a) is extant in Julius Africanus: a descendant of version (b), in Eusebius.”

The *Chronicle* of Africanus in five books is lost except for what is preserved in the extracts made by Eusebius, and the many fragments contained in the works of Syncellus and Cedrenus, and in the *Paschale Chronicon*. For Eusebius we have several lines of transmission. The Greek text of Eusebius has come down to us in part, as quoted by Syncellus; but the whole work is known through (I) the Armenian Version, which was composed in v./A.D.²

¹ A further study of the transmission of Manetho in Josephus is made by A. Momigliano, “Intorno al Contro Apione,” in *Rivista di Filologia*, 59 (1931), pp. 485-503.

² The Armenian MS. G (Codex Hierosolymitanus) printed by Aucher (1818) is dated by him between A.D.

MANETHO

from a revision of the first Greek text,¹ and is, of course, quite independent of Syncellus ; and (2) the Latin Version made by Jerome towards the end of the fourth century.

Possible Sources of the Αἰγυπτιακά.

An Egyptian high priest, learned in Greek literature, had an unrivalled opportunity, in early Ptolemaic times, of writing an excellent and accurate history of Egypt. He had open access to records of all kinds—papyri² in the temple archives (annals, sacred books containing liturgies and poems), hieroglyphic tablets, wall sculptures, and innumerable inscriptions.³ These records no one but an Egyptian priest could consult and read ; and only a scholar who had assimilated the works of Greek historians could make a judicious and scientific use of the abundant material. It is hardly to be expected,

1065 and 1306. Karst quotes readings from this and two other Armenian MSS., but the variations are comparatively unimportant.

¹ See A. Puech, *Hist. de la Litt. grecque chrétienne*, iii. p. 177.

² Herodotus (ii. 100 : cf. 142) mentions a papyrus roll (βύβλος) containing a list of 331 kings. Diodorus (i. 44, 4) tells of "records (ἀναγραφαί) handed down in the sacred books" (ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις), giving each king's stature, character, and deeds, as well as the length of his reign.

³ Cf. the Annals of the Reign of Tuthmôsis III. (Breasted, *Ancient Records*, ii. §§ 391-540) : this important historical document of 223 lines is inscribed on the walls of a corridor in the Temple of Amon at Karnak, and "demonstrates the injustice of the criticism that the Egyptians were incapable of giving a clear and succinct account of a military campaign".

INTRODUCTION

however, that Manetho's *History* should possess more worth than that of his sources ; and the material at his disposal included a certain proportion of un-historical traditions and popular legends.¹

There is no possibility of identifying the particular records from which Manetho compiled his *History* : the following are the kinds of monuments which he may have consulted and from which we derive a means of controlling his statements.

(1) *The Royal List of Abydos*, on the wall of a corridor of the Temple of Sethôs I. at Abydos, gives in chronological order a series of seventy-six kings from Mênês to Sethôs I. Dynasties XIII. to XVII. are lacking. A mutilated duplicate of this list was found in the Temple of Ramessês II. at Abydos (now in the British Museum : see *Guide*, p. 245) : it arranges the kings in three rows, while the more complete list has them in two rows.

(2) *The Royal List of Karnak* (now in the Louvre) has a list of kings, originally sixty-one, from Mênês down to Tuthmôsis III., Dynasty XVIII., with many names belonging to the Second Intermediate Period (Dynasties XIII.-XVII.).

The Royal Lists of Abydos and Karnak give the tradition of Upper Egypt.

(3) *The Royal List of Sakkâra* (found in a tomb at Sakkâra, and now in the Cairo Museum) preserves the cartouches of forty-seven (originally fifty-eight) kings previous to, and including, Ramessês II. It begins with Miebîs, the sixth king of Dynasty I. ; and like

¹ The popular tales introduced kings as their heroes, without regard to chronological order : see G. Maspero, *Bibliothèque Egyptologique*, vol. vii. (1898), pp. 419 ff.

the *Royal List of Abydos*, it omits Dynasties XIII.-XVII. Like (4) the *Turin Papyrus*, the *Royal List of Sakkâra* gives the tradition of Lower Egypt.

(4) More important than any of the preceding is the *Turin Papyrus*, written in hieratic on the *verso* of the papyrus, with accounts of the time of Ramessês II. on the *recto* (which gives the approximate date, c. 1200 B.C.). In its original state the papyrus must have been an artistically beautiful exemplar, as the script is an exceptionally fine one. It contains the names of kings in order, over 300 when complete, with the length of each reign in years, months, and days; and as the definitive edition of the papyrus has not yet been issued, further study is expected to yield additional results.¹ The papyrus begins, like Manetho, with the dynasties of gods, followed by mortal kings also in dynasties. The change of dynasty is noted, and the sum of the reigns is given: also, as in Manetho, several dynasties are added together, e.g. "Sum of the Kings from Mênês to [Unas]" at the end of Dynasty V. The arrangement in the papyrus is very similar to that in the *Epitome* of Manetho.

(5) *The Palermo Stone* ² takes us back to a much greater antiquity: it dates from the Fifth Dynasty, c. 2600 B.C., and therefore contains Old Egyptian annals of the kings. The Stone or Stele was origin-

¹ See Sir J. G. Wilkinson, *Fragments of the Hieratic Papyrus at Turin*, London, 1851: E. Meyer, *Aeg. Chron.* pp. 105 ff., and *Die Ältere Chronologie Babylonien, Assyrien, und Ägyptens*, revised by Stier (1931), pp. 55 ff.

² Plate II. See H. Schäfer, *Abhandl. Akad. Berl.* 1902: Breasted, *Ancient Records*, i. §§ 76-167: Sethe, *Urkunden des Alten Reichs*, pp. 235-249; and cf. Petrie, *The Making of Egypt*, 1939, pp. 98 f.

INTRODUCTION

ally a large slab ¹ of black diorite, about 7 feet long and over 2 feet high ; but only a fragment of the middle of the slab is preserved in the Museum of Palermo, while smaller pieces of this, or of a similar monument, have been identified in the Cairo Museum and in University College, London. Although the text is unfortunately fragmentary, this early document is clearly seen to be more closely related to the genuine Manetho than are the Kings' Lists of later date (1, 2, 3, 4 above).² In a space marked off on each side by a year-sign and therefore denoting one year, notable events are given in an upper section of the space and records of the Nile-levels in a lower. A change of reign is denoted by a vertical line prolonging the year-sign above, on each side of which a certain number of months and days is recorded—on one side those belonging to the deceased king, and on the other to his successor. In the earliest Dynasties the years were not numbered, but were named after some important event or events, e.g. "the year of the smiting of the 'Inu," "the year of the sixth time of numbering". Religious and military events were particularly common, just as they are in Manetho. A year-name of King Snefru (Dynasty IV.) states that he conquered the Nehesi, and captured 7000 prisoners and 200,000 head of cattle : cf. Manetho, Fr. 7, on the foreign expedition of Ménês. So, too, under

¹ More plausibly, according to Petrie (*The Making of Egypt*, 1939, p. 98), the text of the annals was divided among six slabs each 16 inches wide, both sides being equally visible.

² Borchardt, in *Die Annalen* (1917), quoted in *Ancient Egypt*, 1920, p. 124, says, "Manetho had really good sources, and his copyists have not altogether spoiled him".

MANETHO

Shepseskaf, the last king of Dynasty IV., the building of a pyramid is recorded, and under Dynasties I., IV., and VI. Manetho makes mention of pyramid-building. It is especially noteworthy that the first line of the Palermo Stone gives a list of kings before Mênês: *cf.* the *Turin Papyrus*, as quoted on Fr. 1. (For the Cairo fragments see Sethe, *op. cit.*)

* * * * *

In regard to Manetho's relation to his Greek predecessors in the field of Egyptian history, we know that he criticized Herodotus, not, as far as we can tell, in a separate work, but merely in passages of his *History*. In none of the extant fragments does Manetho mention by name Hecataeus of Abdera, but it is interesting to speculate upon Manetho's relation to this Greek historian. The *floruit* of Hecataeus fell in the time of Alexander and Ptolemy son of Lagus (Gutschmid gives 320 B.C. as an approximate estimate); and it is very doubtful whether he lived to see the reign of Philadelphus, who came to the throne in 285 B.C. (Jacoby in *R.-E.* vii. 2, 2750). His *Aegyptiaca* was "a philosophical romance," describing "an ethnographical Utopia": it was no history of Egypt, but a work with a philosophical tendency. Manetho and Hecataeus are quoted together, *e.g.* by Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, chap. 9, perhaps from an intermediary writer who used the works of both Manetho and Hecataeus. If we assume that Hecataeus wrote his "romance" before Manetho composed his *History*, perhaps one of the purposes of Manetho was to correct the errors of his predecessor. No

INTRODUCTION

criticism of Hecataeus, however, has been attributed to Manetho ; and it is natural that similarities are found in their accounts (*cf.* p. 131, n. 2). Be that as it may, Hecataeus enjoyed greater popularity among the Greeks than Manetho : they preferred his "romance" to Manetho's more reliable annals. Yet Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* has no claim to be regarded as a critical history : its value lies in the dynastic skeletons which serve as a framework for the evidence of the monuments, and it has provided in its essentials the accepted scheme of Egyptian chronology.¹ But there were many errors in Manetho's work from the very beginning : all are not due to the perversions of scribes and revisers. Many of the lengths of reigns have been found impossible : in some cases the names and the sequence of kings as given by Manetho have proved untenable in the light of monumental evidence. If one may depend upon the extracts preserved in Josephus, Manetho's work was not an authentic history of Egypt, exact in its details, as the *Chaldaïca* of Bêrôssos was, at least for later times. Manetho introduced into an already corrupted series of dynastic lists a number of popular traditions written

¹ *Cf.* H. R. Hall, *Cambridge Ancient History*, i. p. 260 : "So far as we are able to check Manetho from the contemporary monuments, his division into dynasties is entirely justified. His authorities evidently were good. But unhappily his work has come down to us only in copies of copies ; and, although the framework of the dynasties remains, most of his royal names, originally Graecized, have been so mutilated by non-Egyptian scribes, who did not understand their form, as often to be unrecognizable, and the regnal years given by him have been so corrupted as to be of little value unless confirmed by the Turin Papyrus or the monuments."

MANETHO

in the characteristic Egyptian style. No genuine historical sense had been developed among the Egyptians, although Manetho's work does illustrate the influence of Greek culture upon an Egyptian priest. He wrote to correct the errors of Greek historians, especially of Herodotus (see Fr. 88); but from the paucity of information about certain periods, it seems clear that in ancient times, as for us at the present day, there were obscure eras in Egyptian history.¹ Before the Saïte Dynasty (XXVI.) there were three outstanding periods—in Dynasties IV.-VI., XI.-XII., and XVIII.-XX., or roughly the Old Kingdom, the Middle Kingdom, and the New Kingdom (sometimes called the Empire); and these are the periods upon which the light falls in all histories.

The significance of Manetho's writings is that for the first time an Egyptian was seeking to instruct foreigners in the history and religion of his native land.

Other Works attributed to Manetho.

To judge by the frequency of quotation, the religious treatises of Manetho were much more popular in Greek circles than the *History of Egypt* was; yet the fragments surviving from these works (Fr. 76-88) are so meagre that no distinct impression of their nature can be gained. The *Sacred Book* (Fr. 76-81)

¹ Cf. H. R. Hall, *Ancient History of the Near East* ⁸, p. 14: "In fact, Manetho did what he could: where the native annals were good and complete, his abstract is good: where they were broken and incomplete, his record is incomplete also and confused. . . ."

INTRODUCTION

was doubtless a valuable exposition of the details of Egyptian religion, as well as of the mythological elements of Egyptian theology. It testifies to the importance of the part played by Manetho in support of Ptolemy Sôter's vigorous policy of religious syncretism. It seems probable that the *Sacred Book* was Manetho's main contribution in aid of this policy: it may have been the result of a definite commission by the king, in order to spread a knowledge of Egyptian religion among the Greeks. That an Egyptian priest should seek to instruct the Greek-speaking world of his time in the history of Egypt and in the religious beliefs of the Egyptians, including festivals, ancient rites and piety in general, and the preparation of *kyphi*, is not at all surprising; but it seems strange that Manetho should feel called upon, in the third century B.C., to compose an *Epitome of Physical Doctrines* (Fr. 82, 83) with the apparent object of familiarizing the Greeks with Egyptian science. One may conjecture that his special purpose was to give instruction to students of his own.

The Book of Sôthis (Appendix IV.).

*The Book of Sôthis*¹ or *The Sôthic Cycle* is transmitted through Syncellus alone. In the opinion of Syncellus, this *Sôthis-Book* was dedicated by Manetho

¹ Sôthis is the Greek form of *Sopdet*, the Egyptian name for the Dog-star, Sirius, the heliacal rising of which was noted at an early date: on the great importance of the Sôthic period in Egyptian chronology, see Breasted, *Ancient Records*, i. §§ 40 ff., and H. R. Hall, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*¹⁴, s.v. Chronology. Cf. *infra*, Appendix III., p. 226, and Appendix IV., p. 234.

MANETHO

to Ptolemy Philadelphus (see App. I.). The king wished to learn the future of the universe, and Manetho accordingly sent to him "sacred books" based upon inscriptions which had been written down by Thôth, the first Hermês, in hieratic script, had been interpreted after the Flood by Agathodaemôn, son of the second Hermês and father of Tat, and had been deposited in the sanctuaries of the temples of Egypt. The letter which purports to have accompanied the "sacred books" is undoubtedly a forgery; but the *Sôthis-Book* is significant for the textual transmission of Manetho. According to the LXX the Flood took place in Anno Mundi 2242 (see Frags. 2, 6: App. III., p. 232). This date must close the prehistoric period in Egypt and in Chaldea: the 11,985 years of the Egyptian gods are therefore regarded as months and reduced to 969 years. Similarly, the 858 years of the demigods are treated as quarter-years or periods of three months, thus becoming $214\frac{1}{2}$ years: total, $969 + 214\frac{1}{2} = 1183\frac{1}{2}$ years (Fr. 2). In Chaldean prehistory, by fixing the saros at 3600 days, 120 saroi become 1183 years $6\frac{5}{8}$ months. Accordingly, the beginning of Egyptian and Babylonian history is placed at 2242 — 1184, or 1058 Anno Mundi: in that year (or in 1000, Fr. 2) falls the coming of the Egregori, who finally by their sins brought on the Flood. The *Book of Sôthis* begins with the reign of Mestraïm, Anno Mundi 2776 (App. IV., p. 234: App. III., p. 232), i.e. 534 years after the Flood, and continues to the year 4986, which gives 2210 years of Egyptian rule—almost the same number as Manetho has in either Book I. or Book II. of his *History of Egypt*.



THE *AEGYPTIACA* OF MANETHO:
MANETHO'S *HISTORY OF EGYPT*

ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΑΚΑ

ΤΟΜΟΣ ΠΡΩΤΟΣ

Fr. 1. EUSEBIUS, *Chronica* I. (Armenian Version),
p. 93 (Mai).

Ex Aegyptiacis Manethonis monumentis, qui in tres libros historiam suam tribuit,—de diis et de heroibus, de manibus et de mortalibus regibus qui Aegypto praefuerunt usque ad regem Persarum Darium.

1. Primus homo (deus) Aegyptiis Vulcanus¹ est, qui etiam ignis repertor apud eos celebratur. Ex eo Sol; [postea Sôsis²;] deinde Saturnus; tum

¹ Cf. Joannes Lydus, *De Mensibus*, iv. 86 (Wünsch). On *Maius*, after speaking of Hephaestus, Lydus adds: κατὰ δὲ ἱστορίαν Μανέθων Αἰγυπτιακῶν ὑπομνημάτων ἐν τόμῳ τρίτῳ φησὶν, ὅτι πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων * παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ἐβασίλευσεν Ἡφαίστος ὁ καὶ εὐρέτης τοῦ πυρὸς αὐτοῖς γενόμενος· ἐξ οὗ Ἥλιος, οὗ Κρόνος, μεθ' ὃν Ὅσιρις, ἔπειτα Τυφῶν, ἀδελφὸς Ὅσίρειως. From this passage we see that Lydus gives the sequence "Hêphaestus, Hêlios (the Sun), Cronos, Osiris, Typhôn," omitting Sôsis as Eusebius does. After this passage in Lydus comes Fr. 84 Ἰστέον δὲ . . .

² From Joannes Antiochenus (Malalas), *Chron.*, 24 (Migne, *Patrologia*, Vol. 97).

* Bracketed by Hopfner, *Fontes Historiae Religionis*, Bonn, 1922-3, p. 65.

THE *AEGYPTIACA* OF MANETHO: MANETHO'S *HISTORY OF EGYPT*

BOOK I.

FR. 1 (*from the Armenian Version of Eusebius, Chronica*). DYNASTIES OF GODS, DEMIGODS, AND SPIRITS OF THE DEAD.

FROM the *Egyptian History* of Manetho, who composed his account in three books. These deal with the Gods, the Demigods, the Spirits of the Dead, and the mortal kings who ruled Egypt down to Darius, king of the Persians.

1. The first man (or god) in Egypt is Hephaestus,¹ who is also renowned among the Egyptians as the discoverer of fire. His son, Helios (the Sun), was succeeded by Sôsis: then follow, in turn, Cronos,

¹ The Pre-dynastic Period begins with a group of gods, "consisting of the Great Ennead of Heliopolis in the form in which it was worshipped at Memphis" (T. E. Peet, *Cambridge Ancient History*, i. p. 250). After summarizing §§ 1-3 Peet adds: "From the historical point of view there is little to be made of this". See Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* ⁵, I. ii. p. 102 f. for the Egyptian traditions of the Pre-dynastic Period. In the Turin Papyrus the Gods are given in the same order: (Ptah), Rê, (Shu), Geb, Osiris, Sêth (200 years), Horus (300 years), Thoth (3126 years), Ma'at, Har, . . . Total See Meyer, *Aeg. Chron.* p. 116, and cf. Fr. 3.

Osiris; exin Osiridis frater Typhon; ad extremum Orus, Osiridis et Isidis filius. Hi primi inter Aegyptios rerum potiti sunt. Deinceps continuata successione delapsa est regia auctoritas usque ad Bydin (Bitem) per annorum tredecim milia ac non-gentos. Lunarem tamen annum intelligo, videlicet xxx diebus constantem: quem enim nunc mensem dicimus, Aegyptii olim anni nomine indigitabant.

2. Post deos regnarunt heroes annis MCCLV: rursusque alii reges dominati sunt annis MDCCCXVII: tum alii triginta reges Memphitae annis MDCCXC: deinde alii Thinitae decem reges annis CCCL.

3. Secuta est manium heroumque dominatio annis MMMMMDCCCXIII.

4. Summa temporis in mille et myriadem¹ consurgit annorum, qui tamen lunares, nempe menstrui,

¹ Müller: mille myriadas Mai.

¹ The name Bydis (or Bites) seems to be the Egyptian *bity* "king" (from *bît* "bee"), the title of the kings of Lower Egypt: see the Palermo Stone, and cf. Herodotus, iv. 155, "the Libyans call their king 'Battos'" (P. E. Newberry). Bitys appears in late times as a translator or interpreter of Hermetical writings: see Iamblich. *De Mysteriis*, viii. 5 (= Scott, *Hermetica*, iv. p. 34) where the prophet Bitys is said to have translated [for King Ammôn] a book (*The Way to Higher Things*, i.e. a treatise on the theurgic or supernatural means of attaining to union with the Demiurgus) which he found inscribed in hieroglyphs in a shrine at Saïs in Egypt. Cf. the pseudo-Manetho, App. I.

² There is no evidence that the Egyptian year was ever equal to a month: there were short years (each of 360 days) and long years (see Fr. 49).

³ See *Excerpta Latina Barbari* (Fr. 4) for the beginning of this dynasty: "First, Anubis . . .".

Osiris, Typhon, brother of Osiris, and lastly Orus, son of Osiris and Isis. These were the first to hold sway in Egypt. Thereafter, the kingship passed from one to another in unbroken succession down to Bydis (Bites)¹ through 13,900 years. The year I take, however, to be a lunar one, consisting, that is, of 30 days: what we now call a month the Egyptians used formerly to style a year.²

2. After the Gods, Demigods reigned for 1255 years,³ and again another line of kings held sway for 1817 years: then came thirty more kings of Memphis,⁴ reigning for 1790 years; and then again ten kings of This, reigning for 350 years.

3. There followed the rule of Spirits of the Dead and Demigods,⁵ for 5813 years.

4. The total [of the last five groups] amounts to 11,000 years,⁶ these however being lunar periods, or

¹ Corroborated by the Turin Papyrus, Col. ii.: "of Memphis".

² "Demigods" should be in apposition to "Spirits of the Dead" (νέκρες ἡμίθεοι), as in *Excerpta Latina Barbari* (Fr. 4) and Africanus (Fr. 6. 1). These are perhaps the *Shemsu Hor*, the Followers or Worshippers of Horus, of the Turin Papyrus: see H. R. Hall, *Cambridge Ancient History*, i. p. 265. Before King Mênês (Fr. 6), the king of Upper Egypt who imposed his sway upon the fertile Delta and founded the First Dynasty,—the *Shemsu Hor*, the men of the Falcon Clan whose original home was in the West Delta, had formed an earlier united kingdom by conquering Upper Egypt: see V. Gordon Childe, *New Light on the Most Ancient East*, 1934, p. 8, based upon Breasted, *Bull. Instit. Franç. Arch. Or.* xxx. (Cairo, 1930), pp. 710 ff., and Schäfer's criticism, *Orient. Literaturz.* 1932, p. 704.

³ The exact total of the items given is 11,025 years. So also 24,900 *infra* is a round number for 24,925.

sunt. Sed revera dominatio, quam narrant Aegyptii, deorum, heroum, et manium tenuisse putatur lunarium annorum omnino viginti quattuor milia et nongentos,¹ ex quibus fiunt solares anni MMCCVI.

5. Atque haec si cum Hebraeorum chronologia conferre volueris, in eandem plane sententiam conspirare videbis. Namque Aegyptus ab Hebraeis Mestraïmus appellatur: Mestraïmus autem <haud²> multo post diluvium tempore exstitit. Quippe ex Chamo, Noachi filio, post diluvium ortus est Aegyptus sive Mestraïmus, qui primus ad Aegypti incolatum profectus est, qua tempestate gentes hac illac spargi coeperunt. Erat autem summa temporis ab Adamo ad diluvium secundum Hebraeos annorum MMCCXLII.

6. Ceterum³ quum Aegyptii praerogativa antiquitatis quadam seriem ante diluvium tenere se iactent Deorum, Heroum, et Manium annorum plus viginti milia regnantium, plane aequum est ut hi anni in

¹ Aucher's version runs: duae myriades quatuor millia et DCCCC.

² haud: conj. approved by Karst.

³ Petermann's version of the first sentence of this section runs as follows: Itaque placet (licet) Egiptiis, priscis (primis) temporibus quae praecesserunt diluvium, se iactare ob antiquitatem. Deos quosdam fuisse dicunt suos, semideosque et manes. In menses redactis annis apud Hebraeos enarratis, lunarium annorum myriades duas et amplius etiam computant (computarunt), ita ut tot fere menses fiant, quot anni apud Hebraeos comprehenduntur; scilicet (id est) a protoplasto homine usque ad Mezrajim tempora nostra computando ("And so, for the early times which preceded the Flood, the Egyptians may well boast of their antiquity. They say that certain Gods were theirs, as well as Demigods and Spirits of the Dead. Having reduced to

months. But, in truth, the whole rule of which the Egyptians tell—the rule of Gods, Demigods, and Spirits of the Dead—is reckoned to have comprised in all 24,900 lunar years, which make 2206¹ solar years.

5. Now, if you care to compare these figures with Hebrew chronology, you will find that they are in perfect harmony. Egypt is called Mestraïm² by the Hebrews; and Mestraïm lived <not> long after the Flood. For after the Flood, Cham (or Ham), son of Noah, begat Aegyptus or Mestraïm, who was the first to set out to establish himself in Egypt, at the time when the tribes began to disperse this way and that. Now the whole time from Adam to the Flood was, according to the Hebrews, 2242 years.

6. But, since the Egyptians claim by a sort of prerogative of antiquity that they have, before the Flood, a line of Gods, Demigods, and Spirits of the Dead, who reigned for more than 20,000 years, it clearly follows that these years should be reckoned

¹ Boeckh, *Manetho und die Hundsternperiode*, p. 85, corrects this to 2046.

² Mestraïm: the Mizraïm of *O.T. Genesis* x. 6: Arabic *Miṣrun*, Cuneiform *Muṣri*, *Miṣri* (Egypt). Mizraïm is a dual name-form, perhaps to be explained in reference to the two great native divisions of Egypt, Upper and Lower.

months the years recorded by the Hebrews, they reckon 20,000 lunar years and even more than that number, so that it comes to practically as many months as the years of Hebrew chronology, *i.e.* reckoning our times* from the creation of man to Mezraïm.”)

* Karst emends this to “Biblical times”.

menses tot convertantur quot ab Hebraeis memorantur anni: nempe ut qui menses continentur in memoratis apud Hebraeos annis, ii totidem intelligantur Aegyptiorum lunares anni, pro ea temporum summa, quae a primo condito homine ad Mestraïum usque colligitur. Sane Mestraïmus generis Aegyptiaci auctor fuit, ab eoque prima Aegyptiorum dynastia manare credenda est.

7. Quodsi temporum copia adhuc exuberet, reputandum est plures fortasse Aegyptiorum reges una eademque aetate exstitisse; namque et Thinitas regnavisse aiunt et Memphitas et Saïtas et Aethiopes eodemque tempore alios.¹ Videntur praeterea alii quoque alibi imperium tenuisse: atque hae dynastiae suo quaeque in nomo² semet continuisse: ita ut haud singuli reges successivam potestatem acceperint, sed alius alio loco eadem aetate regnaverit. Atque hinc contigit, ut tantus numerus annorum confieret. Nos vero, his omissis, persequamur singillatim Aegyptiorum chronologiam.

(Continued in Fr. 7(b).)

¹ Petermann renders: ac interim (iuxta eosdem) alios quoque, "and others too, besides these".

² The Armenian version here confuses νόμος "law" and νομός "nome": the Latin translation corrects this blunder.

¹ For the contemporaneous existence of a number of petty kingdoms in Egypt, see the Piankhi *stele*, Breasted, *Ancient Records*, iv. §§ 830, 878, and the passage from Artapanus, *Concerning the Jews*, quoted on p. 73 n. 3. T. Nicklin (in his *Studies in Egyptian Chronology*, 1928-29,

as the same number of months as the years recorded by the Hebrews: that is, that all the months contained in the Hebrew record of years, should be reckoned as so many lunar years of the Egyptian calculation, in accordance with the total length of time reckoned from the creation of man in the beginning down to Mestraïm. Mestraïm was indeed the founder of the Egyptian race; and from him the first Egyptian dynasty must be held to spring.

7. But if the number of years is still in excess, it must be supposed that perhaps several Egyptian kings ruled at one and the same time; for they say that the rulers were kings of This, of Memphis, of Saïs, of Ethiopia, and of other places at the same time. It seems, moreover, that different kings held sway in different regions, and that each dynasty was confined to its own nome: thus it was not a succession of kings occupying the throne one after the other, but several kings reigning at the same time in different regions.¹ Hence arose the great total number of years. But let us leave this question and take up in detail the chronology of Egyptian history.

(Continued in Fr. 7(b).)

p. 39) says: "The Manethonian Dynasties are not lists of rulers over all Egypt, but lists partly of more or less independent princes, partly of princely lines from which later sprang rulers over all Egypt. (*Cf.* the Scottish Stuarts, or the Electors of Hanover.) Some were mere Mayors of the Palace or princelets maintaining a precarious independence, or even more subordinate Governors of nomes, from whom, however, descended subsequent monarchs. (*Cf.* the Heptarchy in England.)"

Fr. 2 (*from Syncellus*).

Thereafter¹ Manetho tells also of five Egyptian tribes which formed thirty dynasties, comprising those whom they call Gods, Demigods, Spirits of the Dead, and mortal men. Of these Eusebius, "son" of Pamphilus, gives the following account in his *Chronica*: "Concerning Gods, Demigods, Spirits of the Dead, and mortal kings, the Egyptians have a long series of foolish myths. The most ancient Egyptian kings, indeed, alleged that their years were lunar years consisting of thirty days, whereas the Demigods who succeeded them gave the name *hóroi* to years which were three months long." So Eusebius wrote with good reason, criticizing the Egyptians for their foolish talk; and in my opinion Panodôrus² is wrong in finding fault with Eusebius here, on the ground that Eusebius failed to explain the meaning of the historians, while Panodôrus thinks he himself succeeds by a somewhat novel method, as follows:

"From the creation of Adam, indeed, down to Enoch, *i.e.* to the general cosmic year 1282, the number of days was known in neither month nor year; but the Egregori (or 'Watchers'),³ who had

¹ This passage follows after Appendix I., p. 210.

² Panodôrus (*fl.* c. 395-408 A.D.) and his contemporary Annianus were Egyptian monks who wrote on Chronology with the purpose of harmonizing Chaldean and Egyptian systems with that of the Jews. Panodôrus used (and perhaps composed) the *Book of Sôthis* (App. IV.).

³ 'Εγγήγοροι, "Watchers, Angels"—in *Enoch*, 179, of the angels who fell in love with the daughters of men. The Greek word 'Εγγήγοροι is a mispronunciation of the Aramaic word used in *Enoch*, 179.

descended to earth in the general cosmic year 1000, held converse with men, and taught them that the orbits of the two luminaries, being marked by the twelve signs of the Zodiac, are composed of 360 parts. Observing the moon's orbit which is nearer the earth, smaller, and more conspicuous, as it has a period of thirty days, men decided that it should be reckoned as a year, since the orbit of the sun also was filled by the same twelve signs of the Zodiac with an equal number of parts, 360. So it came to pass that the reigns of the Gods who ruled among them for six generations in six dynasties were reckoned in years each consisting of a lunar cycle of thirty days. The total in lunar years is 11,985, or 969 solar years. By adding these to the 1058¹ solar years of the period before their reign, they reach the sum total of 2027 years." Similarly, in the two dynasties of nine Demigods,—these being regarded as real, although they never existed,—Panodôrus strives to make up 214½ years out of 858 *hóroi* (periods of three months) or *tropoi*, so that with the 969 years they make, he says, 1183½, and these, when added to the 1058 years from the time of Adam to the reign of the Gods, complete a total of 2242 years down to the Flood.

Thus Panodôrus exerts himself to show that the Egyptian writings against God and against our divinely inspired Scriptures are really in agreement with them. In this he criticizes Eusebius, not understanding that these arguments of his, which are incapable of proof or of reasoning, have been proved

¹ See Intro. p. xxx.

against himself and against truth, since indeed . . . neither Babylon nor Chaldea was ruled by kings before the Flood, nor was Egypt before Mestrem, and in my opinion it was not even inhabited before that time. . . .

Fr. 3 (*from Syncellus*).

On the Antiquity of Egypt.

Manetho of Sebennytyus, chief priest of the accursed temples of Egypt, who lived later than Bêrôssos in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, writes to this Ptolemy, with the same utterance of lies as Bêrôssos, concerning six dynasties or six gods who never existed: these, he says, reigned for 11,985 years. The first of them, the god Hêphaestus, was king for 9000 years. Now some of our historians, reckoning these 9000 years as so many lunar months, and dividing the number of days in these 9000 lunar months by the 365 days in a year, find a total of $727\frac{3}{4}$ years. They imagine that they have attained a striking result, but one must rather say that it is a ludicrous falsehood which they have tried to pit against Truth.

The First Dynasty of Egypt.

1. Hêphaestus reigned for $727\frac{3}{4}$ years.
2. Hêlios (the Sun), son of Hêphaestus, for $80\frac{1}{8}$ years.
3. Agathodaemôn, for $56\frac{7}{12}$ years.

4. Cronos, for 40½ years.
5. Osiris and Isis, for 35 years.
6. Typhôn, for 29 years.¹

Demigods :

7. Ôrus, for 25 years.
8. Arês, for 23 years.
9. Anubis, for 17 years.
10. Hêraclês, for 15 years.
11. Apollô, for 25 years.
12. Ammôn, for 30 years.
13. Tithoês,* for 27 years.
14. Sôsus, for 32 years.
15. Zeus, for 20 years.²

Fr. 4³ (*from Excerpta Latina Barbari*).

In the kingdom of Egypt we have the oldest of all kingdoms, and we are minded to record its beginning, as it is given by Manetho. First, I shall put down as follows the reigns of the Gods, as recorded by the Egyptians. Some say that the god Hêphaestus reigned in Egypt for 680 years: after him, Sol [Hêlios, the Sun], son of Hêphaestus, for 77

*This extract made by an anonymous and ignorant scribe depends chiefly upon Africanus. See Weill, *La fin du moyen empire égyptien*, pp. 640, 642 f., 655 f. Gelzer and Bauer have inferred that the Greek account translated by Barbarus was either the work of the Egyptian monk Annianus (see Fr. 2, p. 11 n. 2) or at least a source derived from him (Laqueur, *R.-E.* xiv. 1, 1081).

*For the divinity Tithoês in two inscriptions of Coptos, see O. Guéraud in *Ann. Serv. Antiq.*, 35 (1935), pp. 5 f.

Sosinosirim¹ annos CCCXX: post hunc Oronptoliarchum annos XXVIII: post hunc Tyfona annos XLV.² Colliguntur deorum regna anni mille DL.

Deinceps Mitheorum³ regna sic:

Prota⁴ Anube S[amusim, qui etiam Aegyptiorum scripturas composuit] annos LXXXIII.

[Post hunc Apiona grammaticus qui secundum Inachum interpretaetur annos LXVII quem sub Argios initio regnaverunt.]

¹ Corrected by the first hand from Sisinosirim: Sosin, Osirim Scaliger. Barbarus probably intended: post istum Sosin, post hunc Osirim. Cf. Cedren., i. p. 36, 2: καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν Σῶσις, εἶτα Ὅσιρις.

² After XLV the digit I or II seems to have been erased.

³ Frick restores: Ἐξῆς Ἡμιθέων βασιλεῖαι οὕτως· α' πρῶτα Ἀνουβις ἔτη πγ'. β' μετὰ τοῦτον Ἀμουσίν <φασί τινες βασιλεύσαι, ὄν> Ἀπίων ὁ γραμματικὸς ὁ καὶ τὰς Αἰγυπτίων γραφὰς συνθεῖς κατὰ Ἰναχὸν ἐρμηνεύει τὸν ἐπ' Ἀργείων ἀρχῆς βασιλεύσαντα ἔτη ξζ'.

μετὰ ταῦτα τοὺς Νεκύων βασιλέας ἡρμήνευσεν Ἡμιθέους καλῶν καὶ αὐτοὺς . . . κρατίστους καλῶν ἔτη βρ'.

⁴ πρῶτα. Along with the reign of the demigod Anubis, Barbarus has preserved a note by Africanus referring to Amôsis: see Fr. 52. This note was, for some reason, transferred from its original place between Potestas XVI. and XVII. See Unger, *Manetho*, pp. 163 f. This mangled sentence, as interpreted by Unger, Gelzer, and Frick, attests the value of the tradition preserved by Barbarus.

¹ The actual total of the items given is 1150 years.

² The translation follows the restored Greek original: see note 3 on the text.

years : next, Sosinosiris [Sôsis and Osiris], for 320 years : then Orus the Ruler, for 28 years ; and after him, Typhon, for 45 years. Total for the reigns of the Gods, 1550 years.¹

Next come the reigns of the Demigods, as follows : first, Anubes ² for 83 years ; then after him, Amusis, some say, was king. About him, Apiôn the grammarian,³ who composed a history of Egypt, explained that he lived in the time of Inachus ⁴ who was king at the founding of Argos . . . for 67 years.⁵

¹ Apiôn the grammarian, born in Upper Egypt, lived at Rome in the time of Tiberius, Gaius, and Claudius : Tiberius called him by the nickname of "cymbalum mundi". As leader of the anti-Jewish movement, Apiôn was later attacked by Josephus in his *Contra Apionem*.

The quotation from Apiôn appears to derive in part from the *History* of Ptolemy of Mendês : see Tatian, *Or. adversus Graecos*, § 38, in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, vi. 880-882, and in Müller, *F.H.G.* iv. p. 485 (quoted in *F.H.G.* ii. p. 533). (Ptolemy of Mendês dated the Exodus to the reign of Amôsis, who was contemporary with Inachus. Apiôn in the fourth volume of his *Aegyptiaca* (in five volumes) stated that Auaris was destroyed by Amôsis.) Much matter must have been common to the works of Ptolemy of Mendês and Apiôn : cf. Africanus in Eusebius, *Praepar. Evang.* x. 10, "Apiôn says that in the time of Inachus Moses led out the Jews". Cf. Fr. 52, 1 ; 53, 9.

⁴ The founder of the First Dynasty of kings of Argos, Inachus is said to have died twenty generations before the Fall of Troy, i.e. circa 1850 B.C. Aegyptus and Danaus were fifth in descent from Inachus : cf. Fr. 50, § 102.

⁵ This appears to be the length of the reign of Amôsis, not of Inachus. Cf. Fr. 52, 1, where Africanus as recorded by Syncellus omits the number of years.

- I. Post hec ¹ Ecyniorum ² reges interpretaetavit,
Imitheus ² vocans et ipsos ³ . . . annos duo
milia C, fortissimos vocans.
- II. Mineus et pronepotes ipsius VII regnaverunt
annos CCLIII.⁴
- III. Bochus et aliorum octo annos CCCII.
- IV. Necherocheus et aliorum VII annos CCXIV.
- V. Similiter aliorum XVII annos CCLXXVII.
- VI. Similiter aliorum XXI annos CCLVIII.
- VII. Othoi et aliorum VII annos CCIII.
- VIII. Similiter et aliorum XIV annos CXL.
- IX. Similiter et aliorum XX annos CCCIX.
- X. Similiter et aliorum VII annos CCIV.

Hec ⁵ finis de primo tomo Manethoni habens tempora annorum duo milia C.

- XI. Potestas Diopolitanorum annos LX.
- XII. Potestas Bubastanorum annos CLIII.

¹ For *haec*.

² These words are perversions of *Νεκύνων* and *Ἡμιθέους* respectively: see p. 18 n. 3.

³ In the lacuna here, there would be an account of the mortal kings to whom the number 2100 (2300) belongs.

⁴ Cf. Fr. 6, Dynasty I.

⁵ For *haec*.

¹ The totals given by Barbarus are generally those of Africanus. Barbarus omits Manetho's Dynasty VII.; and Potestas X. is explained by Gelzer (*Sextus Julius Africanus*, p. 199) as being Manetho's X. + XI. + Ammenemes (16 years) = 244 years. Total, 2300.

² The actual total of the items given is 2260 years.

³ Potestas XI. is Manetho's Dynasty XII. Barbarus therefore gives Dynasties XII.-XVIII.: the totals (corrected by Meyer, *Aeg. Chron.* 99, n. 2) are—XII. 160, XIII. 453, XIV. 184, XV. 284, XVI. 518, XVII. 151,

I. Thereafter he [Manetho] gave an account of the kings who were Spirits of the Dead, calling them also Demigods, . . . who reigned for 2100 years: he called them "very brave" (Herocs).

II. Mineus and seven of his descendants reigned for 253 years.¹

III. Bochus and eight other kings reigned for 302 years.

IV. Necherocheus and seven other kings for 214 years.

V. Similarly seventeen other kings for 277 years.

VI. Similarly twenty-one other kings for 258 years.

VII. Othoi and seven other kings for 203 years.

VIII. Similarly fourteen other kings for 140 years.

IX. Similarly twenty other kings for 409 years.

X. Similarly seven other kings for 204 years.

Here ends the First Book of Manetho, which contains a period of 2100 years.²

XI.³ A dynasty of kings of Diospolis, for 60 years.

XII. A dynasty of kings of Bubastus, for 153 years.

XVIII. 262 (+ XIX. 209). Sum total for Book II. 2221 years: cf. Fr. 55 Africanus, 56 Eus. (Arm.), 2121 years.

The names of Potestates XII.-XVII., or Dynasties XIII.-XVIII., come from some other source than Manetho: the Tanites of Potestas XIII. or Dynasty XIV. appear to correspond with the Hyksôs, just as in the *Book of Sôthis* (App. IV.); while others may be local dynasties of the Hyksôs age. The kings of Hermupolis (Potestas XVII.) apparently denote the kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty, whose names indicate the cult of the Moon-deities 'Ioh and Thôth of Hermupolis (Meyer, *Gesch.*⁵ I. ii. p. 326).

- XIII. Potestas Tanitorum annos CLXXXIV.
 XIV. Potestas Sebennitorum annos CCXXIV.
 XV. Potestas Memfitorum annos CCCXVIII.
 XVI. Potestas Iliopolitorum annos CCXXI.
 XVII. Potestas Ermupolitorum annos CCLX.

Usque ad septimam decimam potestatem secundum scribitur totum,¹ ut docet numerum habentem annos mille quingentos XX. Haec sunt potestates Aegyptiorum.

Fr. 5. MALALAS, *Chronographia*, p. 25 (MIGNE, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 97).

Ταῦτα δὲ τὰ παλαιὰ καὶ ἀρχαῖα βασιλεία τῶν Αἰγυπτίων Μανέθων συνεγράψατο· ἐν οἷς συγγράμμασιν αὐτοῦ ἐμφέρεται ἄλλως λέγεσθαι τὰς ἐπωνυμίας τῶν πέντε πλανητῶν ἀστέρων. Τὸν γὰρ λεγόμενον Κρόνον ἀστέρα ἐκάλουν τὸν λάμποντα, τὸν δὲ Διὸς τὸν φαέθοντα, τὸν δὲ Ἄρεος τὸν πυρώδη, τὸν δὲ Ἀφροδίτης τὸν κάλλιστον, τὸν δὲ Ἑρμοῦ τὸν στίλβοντα· ἅτινα μετὰ ταῦτα Σωτάτης ὁ σοφώτατος ἡρμήνευσε. Cf. *id.*, p. 59: Αἰγυπτίων δὲ ἐβασίλευσε πρῶτος βασιλεὺς τῆς φυλῆς τοῦ Χάμ, υἱοῦ Νῶε, Φαραὼ ὁ καὶ Ναραχῶ

¹ MS. totum. Frick restores the original Greek as follows: μέχρι τῆς ἑξ' δυναστείας ὁ δεύτερος γράφεται τόμος, ὡς δηλοῖ ὁ ἀριθμὸς, ἔχων ἑτη ,αφκ'.

¹ The actual total of the items given is 1420 years.

² 4407 codd.

XIII. A dynasty of kings of Tanis, for 184 years.

XIV. A dynasty of kings of Sebennytus, for 224 years.

XV. A dynasty of kings of Memphis, for 318 years.

XVI. A dynasty of kings of Héliopolis, for 221 years.

XVII. A dynasty of kings of Hermupolis, for 260 years.

The Second Book continues the record down to the Seventeenth Dynasty, and comprises 1520 years.¹ These are the Egyptian dynasties.

Fr. 5 (*from the Chronicle of Malalas*).

[After recording the reigns of Hêphaestus (1680 days), Hêlios (4477² days), Sôsis, Osiris, Hôrus, and Thulis, Malalas adds:]

These ancient reigns of early Egyptian kings are recorded by Manetho, and in his writings it is stated that the names of the five planets are given in other forms : Cronos [Saturn] they used to call the shining star ; Zeus [Jupiter], the radiant star [Phaethôn] ; Arês [Mars], the fiery star ; Aphroditê [Venus], the fairest ; Hermês [Mercury], the glittering star. These names were later explained by the wise Sôtatês [? Sôtadês or Palaephatus³].

The first king of Egypt belonged to the tribe of Cham [Ham], Noah's son ; he was Pharaôh, who was also called Narachô.

³ Palaephatus of Egypt, or Athens, wrote on Egyptian theology and mythology, c. 200 B.C.,—more than seven centuries earlier than Malalas himself (c. A.D. 491-578).

Now, the ancient reigns in Egypt before King Narachô were set forth by the wise Manetho, as has already been mentioned.

Fr. 6 (*from Syncellus*).

Since a knowledge of the periods of the Egyptian dynasties from Mestraïm¹ down to Nectanabô² is on many occasions needful to those who occupy themselves with chronological investigations, and since the dynasties taken from Manetho's *History* are set forth by ecclesiastical historians with discrepancies in respect both to the names of the kings and the length of their reigns, and also as to who was king when Joseph was governor of Egypt, and in whose reign thereafter Moses,—he who saw God,—led the Hebrews in their exodus from Egypt, I have judged it necessary to select two of the most famous recensions and to set them side by side—I mean the accounts of Africanus and of the later Eusebius, the so-called “son” of Pamphilus,—so that with proper application one may apprehend the opinion which approaches nearest to Scriptural truth. It must, above all, be strictly understood that Africanus increases by 20 years the period from Adam to the Flood, and instead of 2242 years he makes it out to be 2262 years, which appears to be incorrect. On the other hand, Eusebius keeps to the sound reckoning of 2242 years in agreement with Scripture. In regard to the period from the Flood down to Abraham and Moses, both have gone astray by 130

¹ See p. 7 n. 2.

² Nectanabô or Nectanebus, the last king of Dynasty XXX.

years belonging to the second Caïnan, son of Arphaxad,¹ even one generation, the thirteenth, from Adam, as it is recorded by the divine evangelist Luke.² But Africanus, in the 20 years which he added between Adam and the Flood, anticipated this; and in the period of Caïnan and his successors, only 110 years remain. Hence, down to the first year of Abraham he reckoned 3202 years; but Eusebius, completely omitting those 130 years, gave 3184 years³ as far as Abraham's first year.

DYNASTY I.

ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

Here is the account which Africanus gives of the dynasties of Egypt [after the Flood].

1. In succession to the spirits of the Dead, the Demigods,—the first royal house⁴ numbers eight kings, the first of whom Mênês⁵ of

which differ from those of Breasted and the German School: he assigns earlier dates to the first twelve dynasties, *e.g.* Dynasty I. c. 3500 B.C. A. Scharff, on the other hand, dates the beginning of Dynasty I. c. 3000 B.C. (*Journ. of Eg. Arch.* xiv., 1928, pp. 275 f.).

Dynasty I. For the identifications of Manetho's kings with monumental and other evidence, see Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*⁶, I. ii. p. 140: he identifies (1) Mênês, (2) Atoti I., II., III., (5) Usaphaïs, (6) Miebis.

(3) Kenkenês and (5) Usaphaïs are two names of the same king: see Newberry and Wainwright, "King Udyumu (Den) and the Palermo Stone" in *Ancient Egypt*, 1914, p. 148 ff.

⁶ On Mênês (c. 3200 B.C.) see P. E. Newberry in Winifred Brunton's *Great Ones of Ancient Egypt*, 1929: Min in Herodotus, ii. 4.

This¹ reigned for 62 years. He was carried off by a hippopotamus² and perished.

2. Athôthis, his son, for 57 years. He built the palace at Memphis;³ and his anatomical works⁴ are extant, for he was a physician.
3. Kenkenês, his son, for 31 years.
4. Uenephês, his son, for 23 years. In his reign a great famine seized Egypt. He erected the pyramids near Kôchômê.⁵
5. Usaphaidos,⁶ his son, for 20 years.
6. Miebidos,⁶ his son, for 26 years.
7. Semempsês, his son, for 18 years. In his reign a very great calamity befell Egypt.
8. Biênechês, his son, for 26 years.

Total, 253 years.⁷

Eusebius also sets out the details of the First Dynasty in much the same way as Africanus.

⁴ For the later study of anatomy (including, perhaps, the practice of vivisection) by kings of Ptolemaic Egypt, see G. Lumbroso, *Glossario*, s.v. 'Ανατομική.

⁵ Kôchômê has been identified with Sakkâra, and excavations carried out there in the Archaic Cemetery from 1935 by W. B. Emery (assisted by Zaki Saad) have gone far to confirm Manetho. Several tombs which date from the First Dynasty were discovered at Sakkâra in 1937 and 1938. One of these, the tomb of Nebetka under the 5th king of Dynasty I., was found to contain in its interior a stepped-pyramid construction of brickwork: during the building the form of the tomb was altered to a palace-façade mastaba.

⁶ These forms are really the genitives of the names Usaphais and Miebis.

⁷ The actual total of the items given is 263 years.

FR. 7 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.¹

Here is the account which Eusebius gives of the Egyptian dynasties [after the Flood].

In succession to the Spirits of the Dead and the Demigods, the Egyptians reckon the First Dynasty to consist of eight kings. Among these was Mênês, whose rule in Egypt was illustrious. I shall record the rulers of each race from the time of Mênês ; their succession is as follows :

1. Mênês of This, with his [17, or in another copy] 7 descendants,—the king called Mên by Herodotus,—reigned for 60 years. He made a foreign expedition and won renown, but was carried off by a hippopotamus.
2. Athôthis, his son, ruled for 27 years. He built the palace at Memphis ; he practised medicine and wrote anatomical books.
3. Kenkenês, his son, for 39 years.
4. Uenephês, for 42 years. In his reign famine seized the land. He built the pyramids near Kôchôme.
5. Usaphaïs, for 20 years.
6. Niebaïs, for 26 years.

¹ The version (transmitted to us by Syncellus) which Eusebius gives of the *Epitome* of Manetho shows considerable differences from Africanus, both in the names of kings and in the length of their reigns. Peet (*Egypt and the Old Testament*, pp. 25 f.) says : "The astonishing variations between their figures are an eloquent testimony to what may happen to numbers in a few centuries through textual corruption." Petrie (*History of Egypt*, i. p. viii) compares the corruptions in such late Greek chronicles as those of the Ptolemies (c.v./A.D.).

ζ' Σεμέμφης, ἔτη ιη' · ἐφ' οὗ πολλὰ παράσημα
ἐγένετο καὶ μεγίστη φθορά.

η' Οὐβιένθης, ἔτη κς'.

Οἱ πάντες ἐβασίλευσαν ἔτη σβ'.

(b) EUSEBIUS, *Chronica* I. (Armenian Version),
pp. 94 sqq.

Post manes atque heroas primam dynastiam numerant VIII regum, quorum primus fuit Menes,¹ gloria regni administrandi praepollens: a quo exorsi singulas regnantium familias diligenter scribemus, quarum successiva series ita contextitur:

Menes Thinites eiusque posteri septem (quem Herodotus Mina nuncupavit). Hic annis XXX regnavit. Idem et extra regionis suae fines cum exercitu progressus est, et gloria rerum gestarum inclaruit. Ab hippopotamo genio² raptus est.

Athothis, huius filius, regno potitus est annis XXVII. Is regia sibi palatia Memphi construxit, et medicam item artem coluit, quin et libros de ratione secandorum corporum scripsit.

Cencenes eius filius, annis XXXIX.

Vavenephis, annis XLII, cuius aetate fames regionem corripuit. Is pyramidas prope Cho oppidum³ excitavit.

¹ Corr. edd.: MSS. Memes.

² Müller conjectures the Greek original to have been: ὑπὸ δαίμονος δὲ ἵπποποτάμου. But the Armenian text, literally translated, is: "by a horse-shaped river-monster" (Karst, Margoliouth).

7. Semempsês, for 18 years. In his reign there were many portents and a very great calamity.

8. Ubienthês, for 26 years.

The total of all reigns, 252 years.¹

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

In succession to the Spirits of the Dead and the Demigods, the Egyptians reckon the First Dynasty to consist of eight kings. The first of these was Mênês, who won high renown in the government of his kingdom. Beginning with him, I shall carefully record the royal families one by one : their succession in detail is as follows :

Mênês of This (whom Herodotus named Min) and his seven descendants. He reigned for 30 years, and advanced with his army beyond the frontiers of his realm, winning renown by his exploits. He was carried off by a hippopotamus god (?).²

Athothis, his son, held the throne for 27 years. He built for himself a royal palace at Memphis, and also practised the art of medicine, writing books on the method of anatomy.

Cencenes, his son, for 39 years.

Vavenephis, for 42 years. In his time famine seized the land. He reared pyramids near the town of Cho.

¹ The actual total of the items given is 258 years.

² See note 2 on the text.

³ Apparently = *Χω κώμην*, for *Κωχώμην*.

Usaphaïs, for 20 years.

Niebaïs, for 26 years.

Mempses, for 18 years. In his reign many portents
and a great pestilence occurred.

Vibenthis, for 26 years.

Total for the dynasty, 252 years.¹

DYNASTY II.

Fr. 8 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Second Dynasty ² consists of nine kings of This. The first was Boêthos, for 38 years. In his reign a chasm opened at Bubastus,³ and many perished.

2. Kaiechôs, for 39 years. In his reign the bulls,⁴
Apis at Memphis and Mnevis at Heliopolis,
and the Mendesian goat were worshipped as
gods.

Ezekiel xxx. 17. See also Herodotus, ii. 60, 137 f. The kings of Dynasty XXII. resided at Bubastis.

Earthquakes have always been rare in Egypt (Euseb., *Chron. Graec.* p. 42, l. 25; Pliny, *H.N.* ii. 82); but Bubastis is situated in an unstable region: see H. G. Lyons in *Cairo Scientific Journal*, i. (1907), p. 182. It stands on an earthquake line, which runs to Crete. A deep boring made at Bubastis failed to reach rock.

⁴The worship of Apis is earlier even than Dynasty II.: see Palermo Stone, Schäfer, p. 21, No. 12 (in reign of Udymu). For Apis, see Herodotus, ii. 153, and Diod. Sic. i. 84, 85 (where all three animals are mentioned). The goat was a cult animal in very early times: cf. Herodotus, ii. 46.

3. Binôthris, for 47 years. In his reign it was decided that women ¹ might hold the kingly office.
4. Tlas, for 17 years.
5. Sethenês, for 41 years.
6. Chairês, for 17 years.
7. Nephhercherês, for 25 years. In his reign, the story goes, the Nile flowed blended with honey for 11 days.
8. Sesôchris, for 48 years : his stature was 5 cubits, 3 palms.²
9. Chenerês, for 30 years.

Total, 302 years.

Total for the First and Second Dynasties [after the Flood], 555 years, according to the second edition of Africanus.

Fr. 9 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Second Dynasty consisted of nine kings. First came Bôchos, in whose reign a chasm opened at Bubastus, and many perished.

He was succeeded by Kaichôos (or Chôos), in whose time Apis and Mnevis and also the Mendesian goat were worshipped as gods.

¹ No queens' names are recorded in the Royal Lists of Abydos and Karnak. Herodotus (ii. 100) records one queen : Diod. Sic. i. 44 (from Hecataeus) reckons the number of Egyptian queens as five.

² The stature of each king is said to be noted in the records mentioned by Diodorus Siculus, i. 44, 4. Cf. *infra*, Fr. 35, No. 3, App. II. No. 6 (p. 216).

3. Biophis, in whose reign it was decided that women also might hold the kingly office. In the reigns of the three succeeding kings, no notable event occurred.
7. In the seventh reign, as the story goes, the Nile flowed blended with honey for 11 days.
8. Next, Sesôchris was king for 48 years: the greatness of his stature is said to have been 5 cubits 3 palms.
9. In the ninth reign there happened no event worthy of mention. These kings ruled for 297 years.

Total for the First and Second Dynasties, 549 years, according to the recension of Eusebius.

FR. 10. ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Second Dynasty consisted of nine kings.

First came Bôchus, in whose reign a huge hole opened at Bubastus, and swallowed up many persons.

He was succeeded by Cechous, in whose time Apis and Mnevis and the Mendesian goat were worshipped as gods.

Next came Biophis, in whose reign it was decreed by law that women also might hold the royal office.

In the reigns of the three succeeding kings, no notable event occurred.

Under the seventh king fabulists tell how the river Nile flowed with honey as well as water for 11 days.

Next, Sesochris ruled for 48 years : he is said to have been 5 cubits high and 3 palms broad.¹

Finally, under the ninth king no memorable event occurred.

These kings reigned for 297 years.

DYNASTY III.

Fr. 11 (*from Syncellus*). THE ACCOUNT OF AFRICANUS.

The Third Dynasty² comprised nine kings of Memphis.

1. Necherôphês, for 28 years. In his reign the Libyans revolted against Egypt, and when the moon waxed beyond reckoning, they surrendered in terror.
2. Tosorthros,³ for 29 years. <In his reign lived Imuthês,⁴> who because of his medical skill has the reputation of Asclepios among the

Pyramid at Sakkâra, which was the work of the great architect Imhotep (Baedeker⁵, p. 156 f.).

⁴ If the emendation in the text be not accepted, the statement would surely be too inaccurate to be attributed to Manetho. The Egyptian Asclepios was Imouth or Imhotep of Memphis, physician and architect to King Zoser, afterwards deified : on Philae (now for the most part submerged) Ptolemy II. Philadelphus built a little temple to Imhotep. See Sethe, *Untersuchungen*, ii. 4 (1902) : J. B. Hurry, *Imhotep* (Oxford, 1926).

One of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, edited by Grenfell and Hunt, P. Oxy. XI. 1381, of ii./A.D., has for its subject the eulogy of Imuthês-Asclepius : the fragment preserved is part of the prelude. See G. Manteuffel, *De Opusculis Graecis Aegypti e papyris, ostracis, lapidibusque collectis*, 1930, No. 3.

AEGYPTIACA (EPITOME) FR. 11, 12

Egyptians, and who was the inventor of the art of building with hewn stone. He also devoted attention to writing.

3. Tyreis (or Tyris), for 7 years.

4. Mesôchris, for 17 years.

5. Sôÿphis, for 16 years.

6. Tosertasis, for 19 years.

7. Achês, for 42 years.

8. Sêphuris, for 30 years.

9. Kerpherês, for 26 years.

Total, 214 years.

Total for the first three dynasties, according to Africanus, 769 years.

FR. 12 (a). (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Third Dynasty consisted of eight kings of Memphis :

1. Necherôchis, in whose reign the Libyans revolted against Egypt, and when the moon waxed beyond reckoning, they surrendered in terror.

2. He was succeeded by Sesorthos . . . : he was styled Asclepios in Egypt because of his medical skill. He was also the inventor of the art of building with hewn stone, and devoted attention to writing as well.

The remaining six kings achieved nothing worthy of mention. These eight kings reigned for 198 years.

Total for the first three dynasties, according to Eusebius, 747 years.

(b) EUSEBIUS, *Chronica* I. (Armenian Version),
p. 96.

Tertia dynastia Memphitarum regum VIII.

Necherochis, sub quo Libyes ab Aegyptiis defecerunt : mox intempestive¹ crescente luna territi ad obsequium reversi sunt.

Deinde Sosorthus . . . , qui ob medicam artem Aesculapius ab Aegyptiis vocitatus est. Is etiam sectis lapidibus aedificiorum struendorum auctor fuit : libris praeterea scribendis curam impendit.

Sex reliqui nihil commemorandum gesserunt. Regnatum est annis CXCVII.

Fr. 14. *Syncellus*, p. 105. *ΚΑΤΑ ΑΦΡΙΚΑΝΟΝ*.

Τετάρτη δυναστεία Μεμφιτῶν συγγενείας ἑτέρας βασιλεῖς ἦ'.

¹ intempestive, Margoliouth ; importune, Aucher ; immaniter, Mai.

¹ Dynasty IV., c. 2720–c. 2560 B.C. For identifications with monumental and other evidence, see Meyer, *Geschichte* ⁵, I. ii. p. 181 : he identifies (1) Sôris (Snofru), (2) Suphis I. (Cheops, Khufu), then after Dedefrê' (not mentioned by Manetho), (3) Suphis II. (Chephren), (4) Mencherês (Mycerinus), and finally (an uncertain identification). (7) Sebercherês (Shepseskaf). For (3) Chephren and

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Third Dynasty consisted of eight kings of Memphis :

Necherochis, in whose reign the Libyans revolted against Egypt : later when the moon waxed unseasonably, they were terrified and returned to their allegiance.

Next came Sosorthus . . . : he was styled Aesculapius by the Egyptians because of his medical skill. He was also the inventor of building with hewn stone ; and in addition he devoted care to the writing of books.

The six remaining kings did nothing worthy of mention. The reigns of the whole dynasty amount to 197 years.

DYNASTY IV.

Fr. 14 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Fourth Dynasty¹ comprised eight kings of Memphis, belonging to a different line :

(4) Mycerinus, Diodorus i. 64 gives the good variants (3) Chabryês and (4) Mencherinus. On the Chronology of Dynasty IV. see Reisner, *Mycerinus* (*cf. infra*, note 2), pp. 243 ff. Reisner reads the name Dedefrê in the form Radedef, and identifies it with Ratoisês.

The Greek tales of the oppression of Egypt by Cheops and Chephren, etc., are believed to be the inventions of dragomans. *Cf.* Herodotus, ii. 124 (contempt for the gods), 129 (Mycerinus), with How and Wells's notes. Africanus has, moreover, acquired as a treasure the "sacred book" of Cheops.

1. Sôris, for 29 years.
2. Suphis [I.], for 63 years. He reared the Great Pyramid,¹ which Herodotus says was built by Cheops. Suphis conceived a contempt for the gods : he also composed the Sacred Book, which I acquired in my visit to Egypt² because of its high renown.
3. Suphis [II.], for 66 years.
4. Mencherês, for 63 years.
5. Ratoisês, for 25 years.
6. Bicheris, for 22 years.
7. Sebercherês, for 7 years.
8. Thamphthis, for 9 years.

Total, 277 years.³

Total for the first four dynasties [after the Flood], 1046 years according to Africanus.

idle pyramids" with "the indispensable structures" of the several aqueducts at Rome; and Pliny (*H.N.* 36, 8, § 75) finds in the pyramids "an idle and foolish ostentation of royal wealth". But the pyramids have, at any rate, preserved the names of their builders, especially Cheops, to all future ages, although, as Sir Thomas Browne characteristically wrote (*Urn-Burial*, Chap. 5): "To . . . be but pyramidally extant is a fallacy of duration" . . . "Who can but pity the founder of the Pyramids?" The modern Egyptologist says: "The Great Pyramid is the earliest and most impressive witness . . . to the final emergence of organized society from prehistoric chaos and local conflict" (J. H. Breasted, *History of Egypt*, p. 119).

² Africanus went from Palestine to Alexandria, attracted by the renown of the philosopher Heraclas, Bishop of Alexandria: see Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 31, 2.

³ The MS. A gives as total 274: the items add to 284.

Fr. 15 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Fourth Dynasty comprised seventeen kings of Memphis belonging to a different royal line.

Of these the third was Suphis, the builder of the Great Pyramid, which Herodotus says was built by Cheops. Suphis conceived a contempt for the gods, but repenting of this, he composed the Sacred Book, which the Egyptians hold in high esteem.

Of the remaining kings no achievement worthy of mention has been recorded.

This dynasty reigned for 448 years.

Total for the first four dynasties [after the Flood], 1195 years according to Eusebius.

FR. 16. ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Fourth Dynasty consisted of seventeen kings of Memphis belonging to a different royal line. The third of these kings, Suphis, was the builder of the Great Pyramid, which Herodotus declares to have been built by Cheops. Suphis behaved arrogantly towards the gods themselves: then, in penitence, he composed the Sacred Book in which the Egyptians believe they possess a great treasure. Of the remaining kings nothing worthy of mention is recorded in history. The reigns of the whole dynasty amount to 448 years.

DYNASTY V.

Fr. 18 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Fifth Dynasty ¹ was composed of eight kings of Elephantine :

1. Usercherês, for 28 years.
 2. Sephrês, for 13 years.
 3. Nephhercherês, for 20 years.
 4. Sisirês, for 7 years.
 5. Cherês, for 20 years.
 6. Rathurês, for 44 years.
 7. Mencherês, for 9 years.
 8. Tancherês (? Tatcherês), for 44 years.
 9. Onnus, for 33 years.
- Total, 248 years.²

Along with the aforementioned 1046 years of the first four dynasties, this amounts to 1294 years.

Fr. 19 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Fifth Dynasty consisted of thirty-one kings of Elephantine. Of these the first was Othoês,³ who was murdered by his bodyguard.

² The items total 218 years ; but if the reign of Othoês, the first king of Dynasty VI. is added, the total will then be 248 years.

³ In the chronology of Eusebius, Dynasty V. is suppressed : the kings whom he mentions belong to Dynasty VI.

The fourth king, Phiôps, succeeding when six years old, reigned until his hundredth year. Thus, along with the aforementioned 1195 years of the first four dynasties, this amounts to 1295 years.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Fifth Dynasty consisted of thirty-one kings of Elephantine. Of these the first was Othius, who was killed by his attendants. The fourth king was Phiôps, who held the royal office from his sixth¹ right down to his hundredth year.

DYNASTY VI.

Fr. 20 (from Syncellus). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Sixth Dynasty² consisted of six kings of Memphis :

1. Othoês, for 30 years : he was murdered by his bodyguard.
2. Phius, for 53 years.
3. Methusuphis, for 7 years.

² Dynasties VI.-VIII., the last Memphites, c. 2420-c. 2240 B.C. Dynasty VI. Meyer (*Geschichte*⁵, I. ii. p. 236) identifies as follows : (1) Othoês (Teti or Atoti), then after Userkerê', (2) Phius (Pepi I.), (3) Methusuphis (Merenrê' I.), (4) Phiôps (Pepi II.), (5) Menthesuphis (Merenrê' II.), (6) Nitôeris. Sethe (*Sesostris*, p. 3) draws attention to the intentional differentiation of the same family-name—Phius for Pepi I., Phiôps for Pepi II. : so also (3) Methusuphis and (5) Menthesuphis, and *cf. infra* on Psametis in Dynasty XXVI. Are these variations due to Manetho or to his source ?

4. Phiôps, who began to reign at the age of six, and continued until his hundredth year.¹
 5. Menthesuphis, for 1 year.
 6. Nitôcris,² the noblest and loveliest of the women of her time, of fair complexion, the builder of the third pyramid, reigned for 12 years.
- Total, 203 years.³ Along with the aforementioned 1294 years of the first five dynasties, this amounts to 1497 years.

Fr. 21 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
EUSEBIUS.

The Sixth Dynasty.

There was a queen Nitôcris, the noblest and loveliest of the women of her time; she had a fair complexion, and is said to have built the third pyramid.

Scemiophris (Sebeknofrurê') closes the line: *cf.* perhaps, in Dyn. IV., Thamphthis, of whom nothing is known.

In 1932 Professor Selim Hassan discovered at Giza the tomb of Queen Khentkawes, a tomb of monumental dimensions, the so-called fourth or "false" pyramid. Khentkawes was the daughter of Mycerinus; and, disregarding the chronological difficulty, H. Junker, in *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Instituts für Ägyptische Altertumskunde in Kairo*, iii. 2 (1932), pp. 144-149, put forward the theory that the name Nitôcris is derived from Khentkawes, and that Manetho refers here to the so-called fourth pyramid, which merits the description (Fr. 21(b)),—"with the aspect of a mountain". See further B. van de Walle in *L'Antiquité Classique*, 3 (1934), pp. 303-312.

³ The correct total is 197 years: the reign of Phiôps is reckoned at 100, instead of 94 years (the Turin Papyrus gives $90 + x$ years).

These rulers (or this ruler) reigned for three years : in another copy, 203 years. Along with the aforementioned 1295 years of the first five dynasties, this amounts to 1498 years.

(Syncellus adds) : It must be noted how much less accurate Eusebius is than Africanus in the number of kings he gives, in the omission of names, and in dates, although he practically repeats the account of Africanus in the same words.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Sixth Dynasty. There was a queen Nitôcris, braver than all the men of her time, the most beautiful of all the women, fair-skinned with red cheeks. By her, it is said, the third pyramid was reared, with the aspect of a mountain.

The united reigns of all the kings amount to 203 years.

DYNASTY VII.

Fr. 23 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Seventh Dynasty ¹ consisted of seventy kings of Memphis, who reigned for 70 days.

Fr. 24 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Seventh Dynasty consisted of five kings of Memphis, who reigned for 75 days.

¹ Dynasty VII.—a mere interregnum, or period of confusion until one king gained supreme power.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Seventh Dynasty consisted of five kings of Memphis, who held sway for 75 years.

DYNASTY VIII.

Fr. 25 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Eighth Dynasty¹ consisted of twenty-seven kings of Memphis, who reigned for 146 years. Along with the aforementioned reigns, this amounts to 1639 years for the first eight dynasties.

Fr. 26 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
EUSEBIUS.

The Eighth Dynasty consisted of five kings of Memphis, who reigned for 100 years. Along with the aforementioned reigns, this amounts to 1598 years for the first eight dynasties.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Eighth Dynasty consisted of five² kings of Memphis, whose rule lasted for 100 years.

“The Turin Papyrus closes the first great period of Egyptian history at the end of what appears to be Manetho’s VIIIth Dynasty (the last Memphites)”: it reckons 955 years from Dynasty I. to Dynasties VII. and VIII. (H. R. Hall in *C.A.H.* i. pp. 298, 170). See A. Scharff in *J. Eg. Arch.* xiv., 1928, p. 275.

² So Aucher, Petermann, and Karst.

DYNASTY IX.

Fr. 27 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Ninth Dynasty¹ consisted of nineteen kings of Hêracleopolis, who reigned for 409 years. The first of these, King Achthoês,² behaving more cruelly than his predecessors, wrought woes for the people of all Egypt, but afterwards he was smitten with madness, and was killed by a crocodile.³

Fr. 28 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Ninth Dynasty consisted of four kings of Hêracleopolis, who reigned for 100 years. The first of these, King Achthoês, behaving more cruelly than his predecessors, wrought woes for the people of all Egypt, but afterwards he was smitten with madness, and was killed by a crocodile.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Ninth Dynasty consisted of four kings of Heracleopolis, reigning for 100 years. The first of these, King Ochthoês,⁴ was more cruel than all his

Manetho's account of Dynasty IX. is best preserved by Africanus. Barbarus has almost the same figures—twenty kings for 409 years.

² Achthoês: in the Turin Papyrus Akhtôi (Meyer, *Geschichte* ⁵, I. ii. p. 247—three kings of this name). Meyer conjectures that the "cruelty" of Achthoês may be violent or forcible oppression of the feudal nobility.

³ Cf. p. 28 n. 3.

⁴ Okhthovis (Petermann's translation), -ov- representing the long o.

predecessors, and visited the whole of Egypt with dire disasters. Finally, he was seized with madness, and devoured by a crocodile.

DYNASTY X.

Fr. 29 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Tenth Dynasty consisted of nineteen kings of Hêracleopolis, who reigned for 185 years.

Fr. 30 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
EUSEBIUS.

The Tenth Dynasty consisted of nineteen kings of Hêracleopolis, who reigned for 185 years.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Tenth Dynasty consisted of nineteen kings of Heracleopolis, who reigned for 185 years.

DYNASTY XI.

Fr. 31 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Eleventh Dynasty ¹ consisted of sixteen kings of Diospolis [or Thebes], who reigned for 43 years. In succession to these, Ammenemês ² ruled for 16 years.

Here ends the First Book of Manetho.

Total for the reigns of 192 kings, 2300 years 70 days.

Dynasty XI. (c. 2100—c. 2000 B.C.) with its seat at Thebes: sixteen kings of Thebes ruling for only 43 years (Manetho): Turin Papyrus gives six kings with more than 160 years.

² Ammenemês is Amenemhêt I. : see pp. 66 f., nn. 1, 2.

Fr. 32 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
EUSEBIUS.

The Eleventh Dynasty consisted of sixteen kings of Diospolis [or Thebes], who reigned for 43 years. In succession to these, Ammenemês ruled for 16 years.

Here ends the First Book of Manetho.

Total for the reigns of 192 kings, 2300 years 79 days.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Eleventh Dynasty consisted of sixteen kings of Diospolis [or Thebes], who reigned for 43 years. In succession to these, Ammenemes ruled for 16 years.

Here ends the First Book of Manetho.

Total for the reigns of 192 kings, 2300 years.

BOOK II.

DYNASTY XII.

Fr. 34 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

From the Second Book of Manetho.

The Twelfth Dynasty¹ consisted of seven kings of Diospolis.

1. Sesonchosis, son of Ammanemês, for 46 years.
2. Ammanemês, for 38 years : he was murdered by his own eunuchs.²
3. Sesôstris, for 48 years : in nine years he subdued the whole of Asia, and Europe as far as Thrace, everywhere erecting memorials of

In Dynasty XII. the conquests of Dynasty VI. in the south were extended ; and Sesôstris III. was the first Egyptian king to conquer Syria. Among works of peace the great irrigation schemes in the Fayûm perpetuated the name of Amenemhêt III. in "Lake Moeris". (See G. Caton-Thompson and E. W. Gardner, *The Desert Fayûm*, 1934.) Manetho mentions his building of the Labyrinth : it is significant that after the reign of Sesôstris III. and his wide foreign conquests, his son should have built the Labyrinth. Vases of the Kamares type from Crete have been found at Kahûn, not far from the Labyrinth.

²See A. de Buck (*Mélanges Maspero*, vol. i., 1935, pp. 847-52) for a new interpretation of the purpose of *The Instruction of Amenemmes* : in this political pamphlet the dead king speaks from the tomb in support of his son Sesostris, now holding the throne in spite of strong opposition, and violently denounces the ungrateful ruffians who murdered him. It seems probable that Manetho's note here refers to the death of Ammenemês I. (Battiscombe Gunn).

his conquest of the tribes.¹ Upon *stelae* [pillars] he engraved for a valiant race the secret parts of a man, for an ignoble race those of a woman.² Accordingly he was esteemed by the Egyptians as the next in rank to Osiris.

4. Lacharês (Lamarês),³ for 8 years : he built the Labyrinth⁴ in the Arsinoïte nome as his own tomb.

5. Amerês, for 8 years.

6. Ammenemês, for 8 years.

7. Scemiophris, his sister, for 4 years.

Total, 160 years.

Fr. 35 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

From the Second Book of Manetho.

The Twelfth Dynasty consisted of seven kings of Diospolis. The first of these, Sesonchosis, son of Ammenemês, reigned for 46 years.

¹ For other names of Amenemhêt III., see note on Marês, App. II., No. 35, p. 224.

² The Labyrinth is correctly attributed by Manetho to Amenemhêt III., who built it as his mortuary temple (contrast Herodotus, ii. 148, who assigns this monument to the Dodecarchy). The Fayûm was a place of great importance during this dynasty, from Amenemhêt I. onwards.

The description of the nome as "Arsinoïte" has often been suspected as a later interpolation; but if "Arsinoïte" was used by Manetho himself, it gives as a date in his life the year 256 B.C. when Ptolemy Philadelphus commemorated Queen Arsinoë (d. 270 B.C.) in the new name of the nome. (*Cf.* Intro. p. xvi for a possible reference to Manetho, the historian of Egypt, in 241 B.C.)

2. Ammanemês, for 38 years : he was murdered by his own eunuchs.
3. Sesôstris, for 48 years : he is said to have been 4 cubits 3 palms 2 fingers' breadths in stature. In nine years he subdued the whole of Asia, and Europe as far as Thrace, everywhere erecting memorials of his conquest of the tribes. Upon *stelae* [pillars] he engraved for a valiant race the secret parts of a man, for an ignoble race those of a woman. Accordingly he was esteemed by the Egyptians as the next in rank to Osiris.

Next to him Lamaris reigned for 8 years : he built the Labyrinth in the Arsinoïte nome as his own tomb.

His successors ruled for 42 years, and the reigns of the whole dynasty amounted to 245 years.¹

FR. 36. ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

From the Second Book of Manetho.

The Twelfth Dynasty consisted of seven kings of Diospolis. The first of these, Sesonchosis, son of Ammenemês, reigned for 46 years.

2. Ammenemês, for 38 years : he was murdered by his own eunuchs.
3. Sesôstris, for 48 years : he is said to have been 4 cubits 3 palms 2 fingers' breadth in

¹ The items given add to 182 years.

⁴ This variant spelling with -ε- for -ι- appears to be a mere scribal error due to confusion with words beginning ἀρσεν-.

stature. In nine years he subdued the whole of Asia, and Europe as far as Thrace. Everywhere he set up memorials of his subjugation of each tribe: among valiant races he engraved upon pillars a man's secret parts, among unwarlike races a woman's, as a sign of disgrace.¹ Wherefore he was honoured by the Egyptians next to Osiris.

His successor, Lampares, reigned for 8 years: in the Arsinoïte nome he built the many-chambered² Labyrinth as his tomb.

The succeeding kings ruled for 42 years.

Total for the whole dynasty, 245 years.

DYNASTY XIII.

Fr. 38 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Thirteenth Dynasty³ consisted of sixty kings of Diospolis, who reigned for 453 years.

Fr. 39 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Thirteenth Dynasty consisted of sixty kings of Diospolis, who reigned for 453 years.

being a name ending in -mes, perhaps Dedumes, the king *Τουτίμαιος* of Fr. 42. The twenty-fifth king in the Turin Papyrus, Col. VII., Kha'neferrê' Sebekhotp IV., is probably the King Chenephre's of whom Artapanus (i./B.C.) says that he was "king of the regions above Memphis (for there were at that time many kings in Egypt)" in the lifetime of Moses (Artapanus, *Concerning the Jews*, quoted by Euseb., *Praepar. Evang.* ix. 27: see also Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* i. 23, 154).

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Thirteenth Dynasty consisted of sixty kings of Diospolis, who reigned for 453 years.

DYNASTY XIV.

Fr. 41 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Fourteenth Dynasty ¹ consisted of seventy-six kings of Xoïs, who reigned for 184 years.

(b) ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Fourteenth Dynasty consisted of seventy-six kings of Xoïs, who reigned for 184 years,—in another copy, 484 years.

(c) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Fourteenth Dynasty consisted of seventy-six kings of Xoïs, who reigned for 484 years.

given by Manetho (76) was not approximated in the Papyrus which shows between twenty and thirty names of kings. Not one of these names is preserved on the Monuments, nor on the Karnak Tablet. The kings of Dynasty XIV., and even the last kings of Dynasty XIII., reigned simultaneously with the Hyksôs kings: *cf.* the double series of kings in Dynasty XVII. In the Royal Lists of Abydos and Sakkâra the rulers of Dynasties XIII.-XVII. are altogether omitted. The Royal List of Karnak gives a selection of about thirty-five names of Dynasties XIII.-XVII., omitting Dynasty XIV. and the Hyksôs.

THE HYKSÔS AGE, c. 1700-c. 1580 B.C.¹

Fr. 42 (*from Josephus, Contra Apionem*, i. 14,
§§ 73-92).

[Josephus is citing the records of neighbouring nations in proof of the antiquity of the Jews.]

I will begin with Egyptian documents. These I cannot indeed set before you in their ancient form; but in Manetho we have a native Egyptian who was manifestly imbued with Greek culture. He wrote in Greek the history of his nation, translated, as he himself tells us, from sacred tablets; ² and on many

Hyksôs brought with them from Asia their tribal god, which was assimilated by the Egyptians to Sêth, the god of foreign parts, of the desert, and of the enemy.

In the first half of the second millennium B.C. the Hyksôs ruled a great kingdom in Palestine and Syria (Meyer, *Geschichte*⁵, i. § 304); and when their power was broken down by the arrival of hostile tribes, King Amôsis took advantage of their plight to drive the Hyksôs out of Egypt (A. Jirku, "Aufstieg und Untergang der Hyksôs," in *Journ. of the Palestine Orient. Soc.* xii., 1932, p. 60).

A dim tradition of Hyksôs-rule is possibly preserved in Herodotus, ii. 128. Perhaps "the shepherd Philitis" in that passage is connected with "Philistines," a tribe which may have formed part of these invaders. There is confusion between two periods of oppression of the common people,—under the pyramid-builders and under the Hyksôs. For a translation of the Egyptian records which illustrate the Hyksôs period, see Battiscombe Gunn and Alan H. Gardiner, *J. Eg. Arch.* v., 1918, pp. 36-56, "The Expulsion of the Hyksôs".

²The word "tablets" is a probable emendation, since Manetho would naturally base his *History* upon temple-archives on stone as well as on papyrus: cf. the Palermo Stone, the Turin Papyrus, etc. (Intro. pp. xxiii ff.).

points of Egyptian history he convicts Herodotus¹ of having erred through ignorance. In the second book of his *History of Egypt*, this writer Manetho speaks of us as follows. I shall quote his own words, just as if I had brought forward the man himself as a witness :²

“Tutimaëus.³ In his reign, for what cause I know not, a blast of God smote us; and unexpectedly, from the regions of the East, invaders of obscure race marched in confidence of victory against our land. By main force they easily seized it without striking a blow; ⁴ and having overpowered the rulers of the land, they then burned our cities ruthlessly, razed to the ground the temples of the gods, and treated all the natives with a cruel hostility, massacring some and leading into slavery the wives and children of others. Finally, they appointed as king one of their number whose name was

Auaris. See Breasted, *Ancient Records*, i. § 24, ii. §§ 296 ff. Meyer adds that he would not be surprised if Manetho's description reappeared word for word one day in a hieratic papyrus. Cf. § 75 ὁ θεός : § 76 the crimes of the Hyksôs (Fr. 54, § 249, those of the Solymites and their polluted allies) : § 77 the upper and lower lands : §§ 78, 237 religious tradition to explain the name of Auaris and its dedication to Typhôn : § 99 hollow phrases about military expeditions of Sethôs : § 237 the form of the phrase ὡς χρόνος ἱκανὸς διήλθεν, and many other passages. See also Weill, *La fin du moyen empire égyptien*, pp. 76 ff.

³ See Fr. 38, n. 3.

⁴ The success of the Hyksôs may have been due to superior archery and to the use of horse-drawn chariots, previously unknown in Egypt (Maspero, *Hist. Anc.* ii. p. 51; Petrie, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*, p. 70; H. R. Hall, *Anc. Hist. of Near East*³, p. 213), as well as to superior weapons of bronze (H. R. Hall, *C.A.H.* i. p. 291 n., 312 f.).

Salitis.¹ He had his seat at Memphis, levying tribute from Upper and Lower Egypt, and always leaving garrisons behind in the most advantageous positions. Above all, he fortified the district to the east, foreseeing that the Assyrians,² as they grew stronger, would one day covet and attack his kingdom.

"In the Saïte [Sethroïte] nome³ he found a city very favourably situated on the east of the Bubastite branch⁴ of the Nile, and called Auaris⁵ after an

hold of the Hyksôs: in *O.T. Numbers* xiii. 22, "Now Hebron (in S. Palestine) was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt," Zoan is Tanis (Dja'net), and the statement probably refers to the Hyksôs age. Sethe cautiously said, "Seth is the god of the Hyksôs cities, Tanis and Auaris". But in *Revue Biblique*, xxxix., 1930, pp. 5-28, Pierre Montet, the excavator of Tanis, brought forward reasons to identify Auaris and Pi-Ra'messes with Tanis; and Alan H. Gardiner (*J. Eg. Arch.* xix., 1933, pp. 122-128) gave further evidence for this view (p. 126): "San el-Hagar marks the site of the city successively called Auaris, Pi-Ra'messe, and Tanis". In spite of the criticism of Raymond Weill (*J. Eg. Arch.* xxi., 1935, pp. 10-25), who cited a hieroglyphic document (found in the temple of Ptah in Memphis) in which Auaris and "the field (or land) of Tanis" are separate, Pierre Montet (*Syria*, xvii., 1936, pp. 200-202) maintains the identity of Auaris, Pi-Ra'messes, and Tanis. [So does H. Junker, *Zeit. f. äg. Sprache* 75. 1939, pp. 63-84.]

Meanwhile, a new identification of Pi-Ra'messês had been suggested: by excavation M. Hamza (*Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte*, xxx. 1930, p. 65) found evidence tending to identify Pi-Ra'messês with the palace of Ramessês II. at Tell el-Yahudiya, near Kantîr, c. 25 kilometres south of Tanis; and William C. Hayes (*Glazed Tiles from a Palace of Ramessês II. at Kantîr: The Metropolitan Museum of Art Papers*, No. 3, 1937) supports this theory that Kantîr was the Delta residence of the Rameside kings of Egypt, pointing out that there is a practically

[Footnote continued on page 83.]

ancient religious tradition.¹ This place he rebuilt and fortified with massive walls, planting there a garrison of as many as 240,000 heavy-armed men to guard his frontier. Here he would come in summer-time, partly to serve out rations and pay his troops, partly to train them carefully in manœuvres and so strike terror into foreign tribes. After reigning for 19 years, Salitis died; and a second king, named Bnôn,² succeeded and reigned for 44 years. Next to him came Apachnan, who ruled for 36 years and 7 months;³ then Apôphis for 61, and Iannas for 50 years and 1 month; then finally Assis for 49 years and 2 months. These six kings, their first rulers, were ever more and more eager to extirpate the Egyptian stock. Their race as a whole was called

unbroken series of royal Ramesside monuments which cover a period of almost 200 years.

In 1906 Petrie discovered at Kantîr a vast fortified encampment of Hyksôs date and a Hyksôs cemetery: see Petrie, *Hyksôs and Israelite Cities*, pp. 3-16 (the earthwork ramparts of the camp were intended to protect an army of chariots).

¹ See Fr. 54, § 237, for its connexion with Seth-Typhon, to whom the tribal god of the Hyksôs was assimilated.

² Of these Hyksôs names Bnôn and Apachnan are unexplained. Apôpi (the name of several kings—at least three), and perhaps Asêth (Assis), seem to be pure Egyptian: Iannas is presumed to be Khian, whose cartouche turned up surprisingly and significantly on the lid of an alabastron in the Palace of Minos at Knossos in Crete, as well as on a basalt lion from Baghdad. On Khian, see Griffith in *Proc. of Soc. of Bibl. Arch.* xix. (1897), pp. 294 f., 297.

³ In his *History* (and for short reigns in the *Epitome*, see e.g. Dynasty XXVII.) Manetho reckoned by months as well as by years, like the Turin Papyrus and the Palermo Stone: see Intro. pp. xxiv f.

Hyksôs,¹ that is 'king-shepherds': for *hyk* in the sacred language means 'king,' and *sôs* in common speech is 'shepherd' or 'shepherds':² hence the compound word 'Hyksôs'. Some say that they were Arabs."³ In another copy⁴ the expression *hyk*, it is said, does not mean "kings": on the contrary, the compound refers to "captive-shepherds".⁵ In Egyptian *hyk*, in fact, and *hak* when aspirated expressly denote "captives".⁶ This explanation seems to me the more convincing and more in keeping with ancient history.

These kings whom I have enumerated above, and their descendants, ruling over the so-called Shepherds, dominated Egypt, according to Manetho, for 511

country" (J. Garstang, *The Heritage of Solomon*, 1934, p. 62).

² This is correct: for the Egyptian word *š'sw*, "Bedouins," which in Coptic became *shôs*, "a herdsman," see Erman-Grapow, *Wörterbuch*, iv. p. 412, 10 (B.G.).

³ In a papyrus (ii./iii. A.D.) quoted by Wilcken in *Archiv für Pap.* iii. (1906), pp. 188 ff. (*Chrestomathie*, I. ii. p. 322) *ἄμμος ὑκσιωτική* is mentioned—aloe [or cement (Preisigke)] from the land of the Hyksiôtæ, apparently in Arabia. This gives some support to the statement in the text.

⁴ Josephus, in revising this treatise just as he revised his *Antiquities*, appears to have used a second version of Manetho's *Ægyptiaca*. Did Josephus ever have before him Manetho's original work? Laqueur thinks it more probable that Josephus consulted revisions of Manetho made from the philo- or the anti-Semitic point of view: see Intro. p. xx. Since the third century B.C. an extensive literature on the origin of the Jews had arisen.

⁵ This appears to be a Jewish explanation (§ 91), to harmonize with the story of Joseph.

⁶ The reference here is to the Egyptian word *h'k*, "booty," "prisoners of war" (Erman-Grapow, *Wörterbuch*, iii. p. 33) (B.G.).

years.¹ Thereafter, he says, there came a revolt of the kings of the Thebaïd and the rest of Egypt against the Shepherds, and a fierce and prolonged war broke out between them. By a king whose name was Mispthagmuthôsis,² the Shepherds, he says, were defeated, driven out of all the rest of Egypt, and confined in a region measuring within its circumference 10,000 *arûrae*,³ by name Auaris. According to Manetho, the Shepherds enclosed this whole area with a high, strong wall, in order to safeguard all their possessions and spoils. Thummôsis, the son of Mispthagmuthôsis (he continues), attempted by siege to force them to surrender, blockading the fortress with an army of 480,000 men. Finally, giving up the siege in despair, he concluded

victorious king was Amôsis, and he took Auaris by main force: the genuine Manetho must surely have given this name which is preserved by Africanus and Eusebius, as also by Apiôn in Tatian, *adv. Graecos*, § 38. See p. 101 n. 2, and cf. Meyer, *Aeg. Chron.* pp. 73 f.

Weill, *La fin du moyen empire égyptien*, p. 95, explains the error by assuming that the exploit of the capture of Auaris was usurped by Tuthmôsis IV., as it was usurped earlier by Hatshepsut and later by Ramessês III.

Breasted (*C.A.H.* ii. p. 83) holds that, since with the catastrophic fall of Kadesh on the Orontes before the arms of Tuthmôsis III. the last vestige of the Hyksôs power disappeared, the tradition of late Greek days made Tuthmôsis III. the conqueror of the Hyksôs. He points out that the name Mispthagmuthôsis is to be identified with the two cartouche-names of Tuthmôsis III.: it is a corruption of "Menkheperre' Tuthmôsis".

³ Lit. "with a circumference of 10,000 *arûrae*". The text (which cannot be attributed as it stands to Manetho — τὴν περίμετρον must be a later addition) implies a wrong use of *arûra* as a measure of length; it is, in reality, a measure of area, about half an acre.

a treaty by which they should all depart from Egypt and go unmolested where they pleased. On these terms the Shepherds, with their possessions and households complete, no fewer than 240,000 persons,¹ left Egypt and journeyed over the desert into Syria. There, dreading the power of the Assyrians who were at that time masters of Asia, they built in the land now called Judaea a city large enough to hold all those thousands of people, and gave it the name of Jerusalem.²

In another book³ of his *History of Egypt* Manetho says that this race of so-called Shepherds is, in the sacred books of Egypt, described as "captives"; and his statement is correct. With our remotest ancestors, indeed, it was a hereditary custom to feed sheep; and as they lived a nomadic life, they were called Shepherds.⁴ On the other hand, in the Egyptian records they were not unreasonably styled Captives, since our ancestor Joseph told the king of Egypt⁵ that he was a captive, and later, with the

also, Jaru-wataš in an inscr. of Boghazköi); the second part, Šalem, is a Canaanitish divine name, found in the texts of Ras esh-Shamra. The name of the city occurs in the El-Amarna Letters in the form "Urusalimmu," the oldest literary mention of Jerusalem.

³ Cf. § 83 for the same information, there attributed to "another copy".

⁴ Cf. *O.T. Genesis* xli. 32-34, xlvii. 3.

⁵ In the Biblical narrative Joseph told the chief butler or cup-bearer (*Genesis* xl. 15). The margin of the Florentine MS. has a note on this passage: "In another copy (*i.e.* of the treatise *Against Apion*) the following reading was found—'he was sold by his brethren and brought down into Egypt to the king of Egypt; and later, again, with the king's consent, summoned his brethren to Egypt'."

king's consent, summoned his brethren to Egypt. But I shall investigate this subject more fully in another place.¹

DYNASTY XV.

Fr. 43 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.²

The Fifteenth Dynasty consisted of Shepherd Kings. There were six foreign kings from Phoenicia,³ who seized Memphis: in the Sethroïte nome they founded a town, from which as a base they subdued Egypt.

The first of these kings, Saïtês, reigned for 19 years: the Saïte nome⁴ is called after him.

2. Bnôn, for 44 years.

3. Pachnan [Apachnan], for 61 years.

4. Staân,⁵ for 50 years.

5. Archlês,⁶ for 49 years.

6. Aphôphis,⁷ (Aphobis), for 61 years.

Total, 284 years.

¹ See p. 80 n. 3. The Saïte nome proper, as opposed to this "Tanite" nome, is mentioned in Egyptian texts of the Old Kingdom. For the famous Saïs, the seat of Dynasty XXVI. (now Sa El-Hagar, see Baedeker,⁸ p. 36 —N.W. of Tanta on the right bank of the Rosetta branch), the centre of the cult of Neith, "the metropolis of the lower country" (Strabo, 17. 1, 18), *cf.* Herodotus, ii. 62; Diod. i. 28, 4 (for its relation to Athens).

² For Iannas (in Josephus), the Khian of the Monuments, see p. 83 n. 2.

³ Archlês here, and in Eusebius (Fr. 48), corresponds with Assis (or Aseth) in Josephus (Fr. 42, § 80); but the change in the form of the name is extraordinary.

⁴ The length of reign (61 years, as in Josephus) leads one to believe that Africanus has transposed Apôphis from the 4th place to the 6th; but in point of fact the last Hyksôs king whom we know by name was called Apepi.

AEGYPTIACA (EPITOME) FR. 44, 45, 46

Fr. 44 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
EUSEBIUS.

The Fifteenth Dynasty consisted of kings of
Diospolis, who reigned for 250 years.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Fifteenth Dynasty consisted of kings of
Diospolis, who reigned for 250 years.

DYNASTY XVI.

Fr. 45 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Sixteenth Dynasty were Shepherd Kings again,
32 in number : they reigned for 518 years.¹

Fr. 46 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
EUSEBIUS.

The Sixteenth Dynasty were kings of Thebes, 5
in number : they reigned for 190 years.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Sixteenth Dynasty were kings of Thebes, 5
in number : they reigned for 190 years.

¹ Barbarus gives 318 years (p. 23, XV.) ; Meyer conjectures that the true number is 418 (*Aeg. Chron.* p. 99). Contrast Fr. 42, § 84 (511 years).

DYNASTY XVII

Fr. 47 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Seventeenth Dynasty ¹ were Shepherd Kings again, 43 in number, and kings of Thebes or Diospolis, 43 in number.

Total of the reigns of the Shepherd Kings and the Theban kings, 151 years.²

Fr. 48 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Seventeenth Dynasty were Shepherds and brothers : ³ they were foreign kings from Phoenicia, who seized Memphis.

The first of these kings, Saïtês, reigned for 19 years : the Saïte nome ⁴ is called after him. These kings founded in the Sethroïte nome a town, from which as a base they subdued Egypt.

with those of Dynasty XIII. tend to show that the Hyksôs rule in the Nile Valley lasted for about a hundred and twenty years, c. 1700-1580 B.C. Under one of the Theban kings, Ta'o, who bore the epithet "The Brave," war with the Hyksôs broke out c. 1590 B.C. ; Kamose, the last king of Dynasty XVII., continued the war of independence, and Amôsis (of Dynasty XVIII.) finally expelled the usurpers.

³ This must be a mistake of transcription : see note 2 on the text.

⁴ See Fr. 42, § 78, n. 3, Fr. 43, n. 4.

2. Bnôn, for 40 years.

3. Aphôphis, for 14 years.

After him Archlês reigned for 30 years.

Total, 103 years.

It was in their time that Joseph was appointed king of Egypt.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Seventeenth Dynasty consisted of Shepherds, who were brothers¹ from Phoenicia and foreign kings: they seized Memphis. The first of these kings, Saïtes, reigned for 19 years: from him, too, the Saïte nome² derived its name. These kings founded in the Sethroïte nome a town from which they made a raid and subdued Egypt.

The second king was Bnon, for 40 years.

Next, Archles, for 30 years.

Aphophis, for 14 years.

Total, 103 years.

It was in their time that Joseph appears to have ruled in Egypt.³

The Armenian text of this sentence is rather difficult, but Professor Margoliouth, pointing out that the Armenian present infinitive is used here for the perfect, approves of this rendering. Karst translates the Armenian in the following sense: "It is under these kings that Joseph arises, to rule over Egypt".

Fr. 49 (*from the Scholia to Plato*).

Saitic, of Saïs. From the *Aegyptiaca* of Manetho. The Seventeenth Dynasty consisted of Shepherds: they were brothers¹ from Phoenicia, foreign kings, who seized Memphis. The first of these kings, Saîtês, reigned for 19 years: the Saïte nome² is called after him. These kings founded in the Sethrôïte nome a town, from which as a base they subdued Egypt.

The second of these kings, Buôn, reigned for 40 years; the third, Archaês, for 30 years; and the fourth, Aphôphis, for 14 years. Total, 103 years.

Saîtês added 12 hours to the month, to make its length 30 days; and he added 6 days to the year, which thus comprised 365 days.³

¹ See p. 95 n. 3.

² See p. 80 n. 3.

³ The addition of 5 days (not 6, as above) to the short year of 360 days was made long before the Hyksôs age: it goes back to at least the Pyramid Age, and probably earlier. The introduction of the calendar, making an artificial reconciliation of the lunar and solar years, perhaps as early as 4236 B.C., is believed to give the earliest fixed date in human history: see V. Gordon Childe, *New Light on the Most Ancient East*, 1934, pp. 5 f.

DYNASTIES, XVIII,¹ XIX.

Fr. 50 (from Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, i. 15, 16, §§ 93-105)—(continued from Fr. 42).

For the present I am citing the Egyptians as witnesses to this antiquity of ours. I shall therefore resume my quotations from Manetho's works in their reference to chronology. His account is as follows: "After the departure of the tribe of Shepherds from Egypt to Jerusalem, Tethmôsis,² the king who drove them out of Egypt, reigned for 25 years 4 months until his death, when he was succeeded by his son Chebrôn, who ruled for 13 years. After him Amenôphis reigned for 20 years 7 months; then his sister Amessis for 21 years 9 months; then her son Mêphrês for 12 years 9 months; then his son Mêphramuthôsis for 25 years 10 months; then his son Thmôsis for 9 years 8 months; then his son Amenôphis

(Chebrôn is unexplained), (2) Amenôphis I., (3) Tuthmôsis I., (4) Tuthmôsis II., (5) Hatshepsut (apparently Manetho's Amessis or Amensis: the same length of reign, 21 years), (6) Tuthmôsis III. (corresponding to Mêphrês, *i.e.* Menkheperre' or Meshperê', and Misphragmuthôsis, *i.e.* Menkheperre' Thutmose), (7) Amenôphis II., (8) Tuthmôsis IV. (the order of these two being reversed by Manetho), (9) Amenôphis III. (Hôrus, the same length of reign, 36 years).

The remaining kings of the dynasty are: Amenôphis IV. (Akhnaten, see p. 123 n. 1), Semenkharê' (? Acenehârês), Tût'ankhamon (? Chebrês), Ay (? Acherrês): see *C.A.H.* ii. p. 702. On rulers Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6, see Wm. F. Edgerton, *The Thutmosid Succession*, 1933.

For Dynasty XIX. see p. 148 n. 1.

² Tethmôsis = Amôsis: see note on Misphragmuthôsis, Fr. 42, § 86. For the scarab of Amôsis see Plate 1, 3.

for 30 years 10 months;¹ then his son Ôrus for 36 years 5 months; then his daughter Acenchêrês for 12 years 1 month; then her brother Rathôtis for 9 years; then his son Acenchêrês for 12 years 5 months, his son Acenchêrês II. for 12 years 3 months, his son Harmaïs for 4 years 1 month, his son Ramessês for 1 year 4 months, his son Harmessês Miamûn² for 66 years 2 months, his son Amenôphis for 19 years 6 months, and his son Sethôs, also called Ramessês,³ whose power lay in his cavalry and his fleet. This king appointed his brother Harmaïs viceroy of Egypt, and invested him with all the royal prerogatives, except that he charged him not to wear a diadem, nor to wrong the queen, the mother of his children, and to refrain likewise from the royal concubines. He then set out on an expedition against Cyprus and Phœnicia and later against the Assyrians and the

³ The margin of the Florentine MS. has a note here: "The following reading was found in another copy: 'After him Sethôsis and Ramessês, two brothers. The former, with a strong fleet, blockaded his murderous (?) adversaries by sea. Not long after, he slew Ramessês and appointed another of his brothers, Harmaïs, as viceroy of Egypt.'" This is intended as a correction of the text of Josephus, but it contains the error of the Florentine MS. in the reading Σέθωσις καὶ Παμέσσης. Sethôsis is the Sesostris of Herodotus, ii. 102, where his naval expedition in the "Red Sea" is described.

Meyer, *Aeg. Chron.* p. 91, considers the words "also called Ramesses" an addition to Manetho. See § 245.

W. Struve (see p. 148 n. 1) would here emend Sethôs into Sesôs, which was a name of Ramesês II.: according to the monuments he reigned for 67 years (*cf.* Fr. 55, 2), and his triumphant Asiatic campaigns were told by Hecataeus of Abdera (Osymandyas in Diodorus Siculus, i. 47 ff.).

Medes ; and he subjugated them all, some by the sword, others without a blow and merely by the menace of his mighty host. In the pride of his conquests, he continued his advance with still greater boldness, and subdued the cities and lands of the East. When a considerable time had elapsed, Harmaïs who had been left behind in Egypt, recklessly contravened all his brother's injunctions. He outraged the queen and proceeded to make free with the concubines ; then, following the advice of his friends, he began to wear a diadem and rose in revolt against his brother. The warden of the priests of Egypt ¹ then wrote a letter which he sent to Sethôsis, revealing all the details, including the revolt of his brother Harmaïs. Sethôsis forthwith returned to Pêlusium ² and took possession of his kingdom ³ ; and the land was named Aegyptus after him. It is said that Sethôs was called Aegyptus, and his brother Harmaïs, Danaus." ⁴

banquet), Diod. Sic. i. 57, 6-8. The tale appears to be a piece of folklore (Maspero, *Journ. des Savants*, 1901, pp. 599, 665 ff.). See Wainwright, *Sky-Religion*, p. 48.

⁴ Danaus : cf. § 231. See Meyer, *Aeg. Chron.* p. 75, for the theory that the identification of Sethôs and Harmaïs with Aegyptus and Danaus is due, not to Manetho, but to a Jewish commentator or interpolator.

The tradition is that Danaus, a king of Egypt, was expelled by his brother and fled to Argos with his fifty daughters, and there "the sons of Aegyptus" were slain by "the daughters of Danaus." The legend appears to have existed in Egypt as well as in Greece : see Diod. Sic. i. 28. 2, 97. 2. For attempts to explain the story in terms of Aegean pre-history, see J. L. Myres, *Who Were the Greeks ?* (1930), pp. 323 ff. ; M. P. Nilsson, *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* (1932), p. 64.

Such is Manetho's account; and, if the time is reckoned according to the years mentioned, it is clear that the so-called Shepherds, our ancestors, quitted Egypt and settled in our land 393 years¹ before the coming of Danaus to Argos. Yet the Argives regard Danaus as belonging to a remote antiquity.² Thus Manetho has given us evidence from Egyptian records upon two very important points: first, upon our coming to Egypt from elsewhere; and secondly, upon our departure from Egypt at a date so remote that it preceded the Trojan war³ by wellnigh a thousand years.⁴ As for the additions which Manetho has made, not from the Egyptian records, but, as he has himself admitted, from anonymous legendary tales,⁵ I shall later refute them in detail, and show the improbability of his lying stories.

Fr. 51⁶ (*from* Theophilus, *Ad Autolyc.* iii. 19).

Moses was the leader of the Jews, as I have already said, when they had been expelled from Egypt by

² The mythical King Inachus was held to be still more ancient: cf. Fr. 4, 1 (p. 19 n. 4).

³ The traditional date of the Trojan war is 1192-1183 B.C.

⁴ This appears to be about four times too high a figure: 250 years would be a nearer estimate.

⁵ Cf. Fr. 54, §§ 229, 287, for Manetho's use of popular traditions.

⁶ This list of Dynasties XVIII., XIX. is obviously derived wholly from Josephus, any variations from the text of Josephus being merely corruptions. Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, wrote his apologia for the Christian faith (three books addressed to a friend Autolycus) in the second half of ii. A.D.

King Pharaôh whose name was Tethmôsis. After the expulsion of the people, this king, it is said, reigned for 25 years 4 months, according to Manetho's reckoning.

2. After him, Chebrôn ruled for 13 years.
3. After him, Amenôphis, for 20 years 7 months.
4. After him, his sister Amessê, for 21 years 1 month [9 months in Josephus].
5. After her, Mêphrês, for 12 years 9 months.
6. After him, Mêphrammuthôsis, for 20 years [25 years in Josephus] 10 months.
7. After him, Tuthmôsês, for 9 years 8 months.
8. After him, Amenôphis, for 30 years 10 months.
9. After him, Ôrus, for 36 years 5 months.
10. Next, his daughter [Acenchêrês] reigned for 12 years 1 month.
11. After her, [Rathôtis, for 9 years.
12. After him, Acenchêrês, for 12 years 5 months.
13. After him, Ac]enchêrês [II.], for 12 years 3 months.
14. His son Harmaïs, for 4 years 1 month.
15. After him, Ramessês for 1 year and 4 months.
16. After him, Ramessês Miammû(n), for 66 years 2 months.

¹ α' i.e. ἔνα, in error for ἐννέα, Josephus, Fr. 50, § 95 (Müller).

² For κε', as in Josephus, Fr. 50, § 95.

³ Δαμενόφης Otto.

⁴ Restored from Josephus (Boeckh): MSS. θυγάτηρ ἔτη ι', μῆνας γ'. μετὰ δὲ ταύτην Μερχερής, ἔτη ιβ', μῆνας γ'.

⁵ μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Μέσσης Μιαμμού, ἔτη [ξ]ς' Otto.

17. After him, Amenôphis, for 19 years 6 months.
18. Then, his son Sethôs, also called Ramessês, for 10 years. He is said to have possessed a large force of cavalry and an organized fleet.

DYNASTY XVIII.

Fr. 52 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Eighteenth Dynasty¹ consisted of 16 kings of Diospolis.

The first of these was Amôs, in whose reign Moses went forth from Egypt,² as I³ here declare; but, according to the convincing evidence of the present calculation⁴ it follows that in this reign Moses was still young.

The second king of the Eighteenth Dynasty, according to Africanus, was Chebrôs, who reigned for 13 years.

The third king, Amenôphthis,⁵ reigned for 24 (21) years.

The fourth king (queen), Amensis (Amersis), reigned for 22 years.

¹ *I.e.* by Syncellus.

² This Greek transcription of "Amenhotpe," retaining both the labial and the dental, is the fullest form of the name, "Amenôthês" showing assimilation: "Amenôphis," which is regularly used to represent "Amenhotpe," actually comes from another name, "Amen(em)ôpe" (B.G.). The month Phamenôth (February-March) is named from the "feast of Amenôthês".

The fifth, Misaphris, for 13 years.

The sixth, Misphragmuthôsis, for 26 years : in his reign the flood of Deucalion's time occurred.

Total, according to Africanus, down to the reign of Amôsis, also called Misphragmuthôsis, 69 years. Of the length of the reign of Amôs he said nothing at all.

7. Tuthmôsis, for 9 years.

8. Amenôphis, for 31 years. This is the king who was reputed to be Memnôn and a speaking statue.¹

9. Ôrus, for 37 years.

10. Acherrês,² for 32 years.

11. Rathôs, for 6 years.

12. Chebrês, for 12 years.

13. Acherrês, for 12 years.

14. Armesis, for 5 years.

15. Ramessês, for 1 year.

16. Amenôphath (Amenôph), for 19 years.

Total, 263 years.

The reference is to the two monolithic colossi of Amenôphis III. (Baedeker³, pp. 345 f.): see Pausanias, i. 42 (the Thebans say it was a statue not of Memnôn, but of Phamenôph, who dwelt in those parts) with J. G. Frazer's note (vol. ii. pp. 530 f.), and Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 61. Amenôphis III. (Memnôn) is correctly named in Greek Amenôth and Phamenôth by the poetess Balbilla (time of Hadrian): see Werner Peek in *Mitt. des Deutsch. Inst. für äg. Alt. in Kairo*, v. 1 (1934), pp. 96, 99; *Sammelbuch*, 8211, 8213.

² For possible identifications of Nos. 10, 12, and 13 see p. 101 n. 1. Nos. 14, 15, and 16 should be transferred to Dynasty XIX.: see p. 148 n. 1. Armesis (Armaïs) is probably Haremhab: Ramessês, vizier of Haremhab and afterwards Ramessês I., was probably of Heliopolitan origin (P. E. Newberry).

Fr. 53 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
EUSEBIUS.

The Eighteenth Dynasty consisted of fourteen kings of Diospolis.

The first of these, Amôsis, reigned for 25 years.

2. The second, Chebrôn, for 13 years.

3. Ammenôphis, for 21 years.

4. Miphrês, for 12 years.

5. Mispfragmuthôsis, for 26 years.

Total from Amôsis, the first king of this Eighteenth Dynasty, down to the reign of Mispfragmuthôsis amounts, according to Eusebius, to 71 years; and there are five kings, not six. For he omitted the fourth king, Amensês, mentioned by Africanus and the others, and thus cut off the 22 years of his reign.

6. Tuthmôsis, for 9 years.

7. Amenôphis, for 31 years. This is the king who was reputed to be Memnôn and a speaking statue.¹

8. Ôrus, for 36 years (in another copy, 38 years).

9. Achenchersês [for 12 years].

[Athôris, for 39 years (? 9).]

[Cencherês] for 16 years.

About this time Moses led the Jews in their march out of Egypt. (Syncellus adds: Eusebius alone places in this reign the exodus of Israel under Moses, although no argument supports him, but all his predecessors hold a contrary view, as he testifies.)

¹ See p. 113 n. 1.

¹ θ' Müller.

² B omits "Αθωπις and Κενχέρης, reading θ' 'Αχενχέρης, ἐτη 15'.

10. Acherrês, for 8 years.
11. Cherrês, for 15 years.
12. Armaïs, also called Danaus, for 5 years : there-
after, he was banished from Egypt and,
fleeing from his brother Aegyptus, he arrived
in Greece, and, seizing Argos, he ruled over
the Argives.
13. Ramessês, also called Aegyptus, for 68 years.
14. Ammenôphis, for 40 years.

Total, 348 years.

Eusebius assigns 85 years more than Africanus to the Eighteenth Dynasty. (Syncellus elsewhere says : Eusebius leaves out two kings, but adds 85 years, setting down 348 years instead of the 263 years of the reckoning of Africanus.)

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Eighteenth Dynasty consisted of fourteen kings of Diospolis. The first of these, Amoses, reigned for 25 years.

2. Chebron, for 13 years.
3. Amophis, for 21 years.
4. Memphres, for 12 years.
5. Mispharmuthosis, for 26 years.
6. Tuthmosis, for 9 years.
7. Amenophis, for 31 years. This is the king
who was reputed to be Memnon, a speaking
stone.
8. Orus, for 28 years.

9. Achencheres . . . , for 16 years. In his time Moses became leader of the Hebrews in their exodus from Egypt.
 10. Acherres, for 8 years.
 11. Cherres, for 15 years.
 12. Armaïs, also called Danaus, for 5 years : at the end of this time he was banished from the land of Egypt. Fleeing from his brother Aegyptus, he escaped to Greece, and after capturing Argos, he held sway over the Argives.
 13. Ramesses, also called Aegyptus, for 68 years.
 14. Amenophis, for 40 years.
- Total for the dynasty, 348 years.

Fr. 54 (*from Josephus, Contra Apionem*, I. 26-31, §§ 227-287).

(Josephus discusses the calumnies of the Egyptians against the Jews, whom they hate.)

The first writer upon whom I shall dwell is one whom I used a little earlier as a witness to our antiquity. I refer to Manetho. This writer, who had undertaken to translate the history of Egypt from the sacred books, began by stating that our ancestors came against Egypt with many tens of thousands and gained the mastery over the inhabitants ; and then he himself admitted that at a later date again they were driven out of the country, occupied what is now Judaea, founded Jerusalem, and built the temple.¹ Up to this point he followed the chronicles : there-

if the Exodus is dated c. 1445 B.C. (see p. 110 n. 2), the Temple was founded c. 965 B.C.

after, by offering to record the legends and current talk about the Jews, he took the liberty of interpolating improbable tales in his desire to confuse with us a crowd of Egyptians, who for leprosy and other maladies¹ had been condemned, he says, to banishment from Egypt. After citing a king Amenôphis, a fictitious person,—for which reason he did not venture to define the length of his reign, although in the case of the other kings he adds their years precisely,—Manetho attaches to him certain legends, having doubtless forgotten that according to his own chronicle the exodus of the Shepherds to Jerusalem took place 518 years² earlier. For Tethmôsis was king when they set out; and, according to Manetho, the intervening reigns thereafter occupied 393 years down to the two brothers Sethôs and Hermaeus, the former of whom, he says, took the new name of Aegyptus, the latter that of Danaus. Sethôs drove out Hermaeus and reigned for 59 years; then Rampsês, the elder of his sons, for 66 years. Thus, after admitting that so many years had elapsed since our forefathers left Egypt, Manetho now interpolates this intruding Amenôphis. This king, he states, conceived a desire to behold the gods, as Ôr,³ one of his predecessors on

² This number seems to be obtained by adding $393 + 59 + 66$: in that case the reign of Sethôsis is counted twice, (1) as 60, (2) as 59 years (*cf.* Fr. 50, § 103).

³ Ôr, or Hôrus, is the ninth king in Manetho's list of Dynasty XVIII. (Frs. 51, 52), in reality Amenôphis III. Reinach points out that Herodotus (ii. 42) tells the same story of the Egyptian Heracles, and conjectures that there is perhaps confusion with the god Hôrus.

the throne, had done; and he communicated his desire to his namesake Amenôphis,¹ Paapis' son, who, in virtue of his wisdom and knowledge of the future, was reputed to be a partaker in the divine nature. This namesake, then, replied that he would be able to see the gods if he cleansed the whole land of lepers and other polluted persons. The king was delighted, and assembled ² all those in Egypt whose bodies were wasted by disease: they numbered 80,000 persons.

"Take counsel at leisure, but accomplish speedily whatever you do".

An ostrakon, found at Deir el-Bahri, and giving the draft of an inscription concerning the deified Amenôphis, was published by A. Bataille, *Études de Papyrologie*, IV. (1938), pp. 125-131: it celebrates the cure of a certain Polyaratos. See O. Guéraud in *Bull. Inst. Fr. d'Arch. Or.*, xxvii. (1927), pp. 121 ff., P. Jouguet, "Les Grands Dieux de la Pierre Sainte à Thèbes," *Mélanges Glotz*, II. pp. 493-500.

For the historical interpretation of this whole passage, §§ 232-251, see Meyer, *Geschichte* ², ii. 1, pp. 421 ff. King Amenôphis is at one time Merneptah, son of Rameses II.; at another time, Amenôphis IV. (Akhnaten), some 200 years earlier. The doings of the polluted, the persecution of the gods, and the slaughter of the holy animals, clearly portray the fury of Akhnaten and his followers against Egyptian religion. For a popular Egyptian parallel to §§ 232 ff., see the Potter's Oracle, one of the Rainer Papyri (iii. A.D.) edited by Wilcken in *Hermes*, xl. 1905, pp. 544 ff. and by G. Manteuffel, *De Opusculis Graecis Aegypti e papyris, ostracis, lapidibusque collectis*, 1930, No. 7; and cf. the prophecy of the lamb, Manetho, Fr. 64.

For a theory about the identity of the polluted (they are the troops of Sethôs I., sent to Tanis by his father Ramessês I. during the ascendancy of Haremhab), see P. Montet, "La Stèle de l'An 400 Retrouvée," in *Kémi*, iii. 1935, pp. 191-215.

² In an incredibly short time (§ 257).

These he cast into the stone-quarries ¹ to the east of the Nile, there to work segregated from the rest of the Egyptians. Among them, Manetho adds, there were some of the learned priests, who had been attacked by leprosy. Then this wise seer Amenôphis was filled with dread of divine wrath against himself and the king if the outrage done to these persons should be discovered ; and he added a prediction that certain allies would join the polluted people and would take possession of Egypt for 13 years. Not venturing to make this prophecy himself to the king, he left a full account of it in writing, and then took his own life. The king was filled with despondency. Then Manetho continues as follows (I quote his account *verbatim*) : “ When the men in the stone-quarries had suffered hardships for a considerable time, they begged the king to assign to them as a dwelling-place and a refuge the deserted city of the Shepherds, Auaris, and he consented. According to religious tradition ² this city was from earliest times dedicated to Typhôn. Occupying this city and using the region as a base for revolt, they appointed as their leader one of the priests of Héliopolis called Osarsêph,³

¹ The quarries of Tura were known to Herodotus (ii. 8, 124) as the source of building-stone for the Pyramids.

On forced labour in quarries in Ptolemaic times, Reinach refers to Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Lagides*, iii. 241 ; iv. 193, 337 f.

² Cf. Fr. 42, § 78.

³ Osarsêph, the leader of the movement, is later (§ 250) identified with Moses. The name Osarsêph is a possible Egyptian name : cf. Ranke, *Personennamen* I. p. 85, No. 3 *wsîr-sp'*. Wilcken (*Chrestomathie*, i. 1, p. 106) derives the name from a holy animal Sêph ; but the Jews would naturally see in it a form of the name Joseph.

and took an oath of obedience to him in everything. First of all, he made it a law ¹ that they should neither worship the gods nor refrain from any of the animals ² prescribed as especially sacred in Egypt, but should sacrifice and consume all alike, and that they should have intercourse with none save those of their own confederacy. After framing a great number of laws like these, completely opposed to Egyptian custom, he ordered them with their multitude of hands, to repair the walls of the city and make ready for war against King Amenôphis. Then, acting in concert with certain other priests and polluted persons like himself, he sent an embassy to the Shepherds who had been expelled by Tethmôsis,³ in the city called Jerusalem; and, setting forth the circumstances of himself and his companions in distress, he begged them to unite wholeheartedly in an attack upon Egypt. He offered to conduct them first to their ancestral home at Auaris, to provide their hosts with lavish supplies, to fight on their behalf whenever need arose, and to bring Egypt without difficulty under their sway. Overjoyed at the proposal, all the Shepherds, to the number of 200,000, eagerly set out,

19; *Carmen Aureum*, v. 1; cf. Dieterich, *Nekyia*, pp. 146 f.) which inculcate reverence for the gods as the first precept?" (Reinach). Add Isocrates, *Ad Demonicum*, §§ 13, 16, and the *Precepts of Sansnôs* (ii./iii. A.D.), as inscribed in Nubia, *C.I.G.* iii. 5041 (Wilcken, *Chrestomathie*, I. ii. p. 147, No. 116)—the first precept is "Revere the divinity".

² Cf. Tac., *Hist.* v. 4: the Jews under Moses sacrificed the ram as if to insult Ammôn, and the bull, because the Egyptians worship Apis. Cf. *O.T. Leviticus* xvi. 3.

³ Tethmôsis for Amôsis, as in Fr. 50 (§ 94).

and before long arrived at Auaris. When Amenôphis, king of Egypt, learned of their invasion, he was sorely troubled, for he recalled the prediction of Amenôphis, son of Paapis. First, he gathered a multitude of Egyptians; and having taken counsel with the leading men among them, he summoned to his presence the sacred animals which were held in greatest reverence in the temples, and gave instructions to each group of priests to conceal the images of the gods as securely as possible. As for his five-year-old son Sethôs, also called Ramessês after his grandfather Rapsês,¹ he sent him safely away to his friend.² He then crossed the Nile with as many as 300,000 of the bravest warriors of Egypt, and met the enemy. But, instead of joining battle, he decided that he must not fight against the gods, and made a hasty retreat to Memphis. There he took into his charge Apis and the other sacred animals which he had summoned to that place; and forthwith he set off for Ethiopia³ with his whole army and the host of Egyptians. The Ethiopian king, who, in gratitude for a service, had become his subject, welcomed him, maintained the whole multitude with such products of the country as were fit for human consumption,

¹ Rapsês: doubtless an error for Rampsês. There is confusion here: the grandfather is Ramessês II. See Meyer (*Aeg. Chron.* p. 91), who considers the words "Sethôs also called" an interpolation (*cf.* § 98), intended to identify a Sethôs son of Amenôphis and a Ramessês son of Amenôphis.

² A curious indefiniteness: the reference may be to the king of Ethiopia, mentioned in the next section.

³ The truth is that Ethiopia (Nubia, Cush) was at that time a province of the kingdom of the Pharaohs.

assigned to them cities and villages sufficient for the destined period of 13 years' banishment from his realm, and especially stationed an Ethiopian army on the frontiers of Egypt to guard King Amenôphis and his followers. Such was the situation in Ethiopia. Meanwhile, the Solymites [or dwellers in Jerusalem] made a descent along with the polluted Egyptians, and treated the people so impiously and savagely that the domination of the Shepherds seemed like a golden age to those who witnessed the present enormities. For not only did they set towns and villages on fire, pillaging the temples and mutilating images of the gods without restraint, but they also made a practice of using the sanctuaries as kitchens to roast the sacred animals which the people worshipped; and they would compel the priests and prophets to sacrifice and butcher the beasts, afterwards casting the men forth naked. It is said that the priest who framed their constitution and their laws was a native of Hêliopolis, named Osarsêph after the god Osiris, worshipped at Hêliopolis; but when he joined this people, he changed his name and was called Moses."¹

Such, then, are the Egyptian stories about the Jews,² together with many other tales which I pass

anti-Semitic commentator on Manetho. It is interesting that Osiris should be thus identified with the mysterious god of the Jews, whose name must not be uttered.

² Cf. Hecataeus of Abdera (in Diodorus Siculus, xl. 3): the Jews are foreigners expelled from Egypt because of a plague. See Meyer, *Geschichte*², ii. 1, p. 424. Hecataeus lived for some time at the court of Ptolemy I. (323-285 B.C.), and used Egyptian sources for his *Aegyptiaca*. Cf. Intro. pp. xxvi f.

by for brevity's sake. Manetho adds, however, that, at a later date, Amenôphis advanced from Ethiopia with a large army, his son Rampsês also leading a force, and that the two together joined battle with the Shepherds and their polluted allies, and defeated them, killing many and pursuing the others to the frontiers of Syria. This then, with other tales of a like nature, is Manetho's account. Before I give proof that his words are manifest lies and nonsense, I shall mention one particular point, which bears upon my later refutation of other writers. Manetho has made one concession to us. He has admitted that our race was not Egyptian in origin, but came into Egypt from elsewhere, took possession of the land, and afterwards left it. But that we were not, at a later time, mixed up with disease-ravaged Egyptians, and that, so far from being one of these, Moses, the leader of our people, lived many generations earlier, I shall endeavour to prove from Manetho's own statements.

To begin with, the reason which he suggests for his fiction is ridiculous. "King Amenôphis," he says, "conceived a desire to see the gods." Gods indeed! If he means the gods established by their ordinances,—bull, goat, crocodiles, and dog-faced baboons,—he had them before his eyes; and as for the gods of heaven, how could he see them? And why did he conceive this eager desire? Because, by Zeus,¹ before his time another king

¹ A strange expression which seems to belong to an anti-Semitic polemic. In Josephus, *c. Apion.* ii. 263 (a passage about Socrates), *ὃν Δία* has been restored to the text by Niese's conjecture.

had seen them ! From this predecessor, then, he had learned their nature and the manner in which he had seen them, and in consequence he had no need of a new system. Moreover, the prophet by whose aid the king expected to succeed in his endeavour, was a sage. How, then, did he fail to foresee the impossibility of realizing this desire ? It did, in fact, come to naught. And what reason had he for ascribing the invisibility of the gods to the presence of cripples or lepers ? Divine wrath is due to impious deeds, not to physical deformities. Next, how could 80,000 lepers and invalids be gathered together in practically a single day ? And why did the king turn a deaf ear to the prophet ? The prophet had bidden him expel the cripples from Egypt, but the king cast them into stone-quarries, as if he needed labourers, not as if his purpose was to purge the land. Manetho says, moreover, that the prophet took his own life, because he foresaw the anger of the gods and the fate in store for Egypt, but left in writing his prediction to the king. Then how was it that the prophet had not from the first foreknowledge of his own death ? Why did he not forthwith oppose the king's desire to see the gods ? Was it reasonable to be afraid of misfortunes which were not to happen in his time ? Or what worse fate could have been his than that which he hastened to inflict upon himself ?

But let us now examine ¹ the most ridiculous part

¹The passage §§ 260-266 repeats unnecessarily the substance of §§ 237-250 : possibly these are extracts from two treatises utilizing the same material.

of the whole story. Although he had learned these facts, and had conceived a dread of the future, the king did not, even then, expel from his land those cripples of whose taint he had previously been bidden to purge Egypt, but instead, at their request, he gave them as their city (Manetho says) the former habitation of the Shepherds, Auaris, as it was called. Here, he adds, they assembled, and selected as their leader a man who had formerly been a priest in Heliopolis. This man (according to Manetho) instructed them not to worship the gods nor to refrain from the animals revered in Egypt, but to sacrifice and devour them all, and to have intercourse with none save those of their own confederacy. Then having bound his followers by oath to abide strictly by these laws, he fortified Auaris and waged war against the king. This leader, Manetho adds, sent to Jerusalem, inviting the people to join in alliance with him, and promising to give them Auaris, which, he reminded them, was the ancestral home of those who would come from Jerusalem, and would serve as a base for their conquest of the whole of Egypt. Then, continues Manetho, they advanced with an army of 200,000 men; and Amenôphis, king of Egypt, thinking he ought not to fight against the gods, fled straightway into Ethiopia after enjoining that Apis and some of the other sacred animals should be entrusted to the custody of the priests. Thereafter, the men from Jerusalem came on, made desolate the cities, burned down the temples, massacred

¹ Cobet: *καθαρεῦσαι* L.

² Conj. Niese: *ἐπ'* L.

³ Niese: *συνωμοσμένων* L.

⁴ Bekker: *ἱππέας* L, Lat.

the priests, and, in short, committed every possible kind of lawlessness and savagery. The priest who framed their constitution and their laws was, according to Manetho, a native of Héliopolis, Osarsêph by name, after Osiris the god worshipped in Héliopolis: but he changed his name and called himself Moses. Thirteen years later—this being the destined period of his exile—Amenôphis, according to Manetho, advanced from Ethiopia with a large army, and joining battle with the Shepherds and the polluted people, he defeated them, killing many, after pursuing them to the frontiers of Syria.

Here again Manetho fails to realize the improbability of his lying tale. Even if the lepers and their accompanying horde were previously angry with the king and the others who had treated them thus in obedience to the seer's prediction, certainly when they had left the stone-quarries and received from him a city and land, they would have grown more kindly disposed to him. If indeed they still hated him, they would have plotted against him personally, instead of declaring war against the whole people; for obviously so large a company must have had numerous relatives in Egypt. Notwithstanding, once they had resolved to make war on the Egyptians, they would never have ventured to direct their warfare against their gods, nor would they have framed laws completely opposed to the ancestral code under which they had been brought up. We must, however, be grateful to Manetho for stating that the

⁶ *ἀν αὐτῶ* *ed. pr.*: *ἄνω* (= *ἀνθρώπων*) L: *ἄν* (alone) conj. Niese: *ἄν ἀνθρώπων* Reinach.

⁷ Niese: *Μαρέθωνι* L.

authors of this lawlessness were not the newcomers from Jerusalem, but that company of people who were themselves Egyptians, and that it was, above all, their priests who devised the scheme and bound the multitude by oath.

Moreover, how absurd it is to imagine that, while none of their relatives and friends joined in the revolt and shared in the perils of war, these polluted persons sent to Jerusalem and gained allies there! What alliance, what connexion had previously existed between them? Why, on the contrary, they were enemies, and differed widely in customs. Yet Manetho says that they lent a ready ear to the promise that they would occupy Egypt, just as if they were not thoroughly acquainted with the country from which they had been forcibly expelled! Now, if they had been in straitened or unhappy circumstances, they would perhaps have taken the risk; but dwelling, as they did, in a prosperous city and enjoying the fruits of an ample country, superior to Egypt, why ever should they be likely to hazard their lives by succouring their former foes, those maimed cripples, whom none even of their own kinsfolk could endure? For of course they did not foresee that the king would take flight. On the contrary, Manetho has himself stated that the son¹ of

Pêlusium, "the celebrated eastern seaport and key to Egypt" (Baedeker⁸, pp. 197, f.), the famous frontier fortress, in Ancient Egyptian *Šnw*. A scarab of the late Twelfth Dynasty or early Thirteenth, published by Newberry in *J. Eg. Arch.* xviii. (1932), p. 141, shows the place-name written within the fortress-sign. The name Pêlusium is from *πηλός* "mud": cf. Strabo, 17. 1, 21, for the muddy pools or marshes around Pêlusium.

Amenôphis marched with 300,000 men to confront them at Pêlusium. This was certainly known to those already present ; but how could they possibly guess that he would change his mind and flee ? Manetho next says that, after conquering Egypt, the invaders from Jerusalem committed many heinous crimes ; and for these he reproaches them, just as if he had not brought them in as enemies, or as if he was bound to accuse allies from abroad of actions which before their arrival native Egyptians were performing and had sworn to perform. But, years later, Amenôphis returned to the attack, conquered the enemy in battle, and drove them, with slaughter, right to Syria. So perfectly easy a prey is Egypt to invaders, no matter whence they come ! And yet those who at that time conquered the land, on learning that Amenôphis was alive, neither fortified the passes between it and Ethiopia, although their resources were amply sufficient, nor did they keep the rest of their forces in readiness ! Amenôphis, according to Manetho, pursued them with carnage over the sandy desert right to Syria. But obviously it is no easy matter for an army to cross the desert even without fighting.

Thus, according to Manetho, our race is not of Egyptian origin, nor did it receive any admixture of Egyptians. For, naturally, many of the lepers and invalids died in the stone-quarries during their long term of hardship, many others in the subsequent battles, and most of all in the final engagement and the rout.

² Reinach : αὐτοῖς L.

³ Conj. Thackeray : καὶ L.

It remains for me to reply to Manetho's statements about Moses. The Egyptians regard him as a wonderful, even a divine being, but wish to claim him as their own by an incredible calumny, alleging that he belonged to Héliopolis and was dismissed from his priesthood there owing to leprosy. The records, however, show that he lived 518 years ¹ earlier, and led our forefathers up out of Egypt to the land which we inhabit at the present time. And that he suffered from no such physical affliction is clear from his own words. He has, in fact, forbidden lepers ² either to stay in a town or to make their abode in a village; they must go about in solitude, with their garments rent. Anyone who touches them or lives under the same roof with them he considers unclean. Moreover, even if the malady is cured and the leper resumes normal health, Moses has prescribed certain rites of purification—to cleanse himself in a bath of spring-water and to shave off all his hair,—and enjoins the performance of a number of different sacrifices before entrance into the holy city. Yet it would have been natural, on the contrary, for a victim of this scourge to show some consideration and kindly feeling for those who shared the same misfortune. It was not only about lepers that he framed such laws: those who had even the slightest mutilation of the body were disqualified for the priesthood; ³ and if a priest in the course of his ministry met with an

¹ 518 years. See n. on § 230.

² For the laws of leprosy, here summarized, see *O.T. Leviticus* xiii. (especially 45 f.) and xiv.

³ Cf. *Leviticus* xxi. 17-23 (exclusion from the priesthood of anyone "that hath a blemish").

accident of this nature, he was deprived of his office. How improbable, then, that Moses should be so foolish as to frame these laws, or that men brought together by such misfortunes should approve of legislation against themselves, to their own shame and injury ! But, further, the name, too, has been transformed in an extremely improbable way. According to Manetho, Moses was called Osarsêph. These names, however, are not interchangeable : the true name means "one saved out of the water," for water is called "mō-y" by the Egyptians.¹

It is now, therefore, sufficiently obvious, I think, that, so long as Manetho followed the ancient records, he did not stray far from the truth ; but when he turned to unauthorized legends, he either combined them in an improbable form or else gave credence to certain prejudiced informants.

Ms. from the Old Kingdom, *Ms* (very common) from the New Kingdom. In *Exodus* ii. 10 "Moses" is "drawn out" (Hebr. *mashah*) of the water—a derivation "hardly meant to be taken seriously" (T. H. Robinson, in Oesterley and Robinson, *History of Israel*, I. p. 81).

See further Alan H. Gardiner, "The Egyptian Origin of some English Personal Names," in *Journ. of Amer. Orient. Soc.* 56 (1936), pp. 192-4. Gardiner points out (p. 195, n. 28) that ὕσῆς (mentioned above) is clearly a perversion of αἰῆς [or εἰῆς, = Egyptian *ḥsy*, "praised," LS⁹], the Greek equivalent of the Coptic *hasiē*, "favoured"; but an Egyptian became "favoured" by the fact of being drowned, not by being saved from drowning.

DYNASTY XIX.

Fr. 55 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Nineteenth Dynasty¹ consisted of seven (six) kings of Diospolis.

1. Sethôs, for 51 years.
2. Rapsacês, for 61 (66) years.
3. Ammenephthês, for 20 years.
4. Ramessês, for 60 years.
5. Ammenemnês, for 5 years.
6. Thuôris, who in Homer is called Polybus, husband of Alcandra, and in whose time Troy was taken,² reigned for 7 years.

Total, 209 years.

(Ramessês II. Seso), (5) Amenephthês (Merneptah), (6) [Amenophthês or Menophthês, emended from the form Menophrês in Theon of Alexandria], (Seti II. Merneptah), (7) Ramessês III. Siptah, (8) Ammenemes (Amenmeses), (9) Thuôris or Thuôsrîs, also called Siphthas. Cf. Petrie, *History of Egypt*, iii. pp. 120 ff. Struve points also to a new Sôthis date, 1318 B.C., in the reign of Seti I. (according to Petrie's chronology, 1326-1300 B.C.).

¹The Fall of Troy was traditionally dated 1183 B.C.: cf. p. 107 n. 3.

In Homer, *Odyssey*, iv. 126, a golden distaff and a silver work-basket with wheels beneath and golden rims,—treasures in the palace of Menelaus at Sparta,—are described as gifts to Helen from "Alcandrê, the wife of Polybus who dwelt in Egyptian Thebes where the amplest store of wealth is laid up in men's houses"; while to Menelaus himself Polybus had given two silver baths, two tripods, and ten talents of gold. See W. H. D. Rouse, *The Story of Odysseus*, 1937, p. 56: "Polybos was a great nobleman in the Egyptian Thebes, with a palace full of treasures".

Sum total in the Second Book of Manetho, ninety-six kings, for 2121 years.¹

Fr. 56 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
EUSEBIUS.

The Nineteenth Dynasty consisted of five kings of Diospolis.

1. Sethôs, for 55 years.
2. Rampsês, for 66 years.
3. Ammenephthis, for 40 years.
4. Ammenemês, for 26 years.
5. Thuôris, who in Homer is called Polybus, husband of Alcandra, and in whose reign Troy was taken, reigned for 7 years.

Total, 194 years.

Sum total in the Second Book of Manetho, for ninety-two kings, 1121 (2121) years.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Nineteenth Dynasty consisted of five kings of Diospolis.

1. Sethos, for 55 years.
2. Rampses, for 66 years.
3. Amenephthis, for 8 years.
4. Ammenemes, for 26 years.

¹ For the corrected total of Book II., see Fr. 4, n. 4 (246 or 289 kings for 2221 years). The wide difference between the number of kings (96 or 92 as compared with 246 or 289) is puzzling: Meyer conjectures that about 150 or 193 of the larger numbers were ephemeral or co-regents.

5. Thuoris, by Homer called the active and gallant Polybus, in whose time Troy was taken, reigned for 7 years.

Total, 194 years.

In the Second Book of Manetho there is a total of ninety-two kings, reigning for 2121 years.

BOOK III.

DYNASTY XX.

Fr. 57 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

From the Third Book of Manetho.

The Twentieth Dynasty ¹ consisted of twelve kings of Diospolis, who reigned for 135 years.

(b) ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

From the Third Book of Manetho.

The Twentieth Dynasty consisted of twelve kings of Diospolis, who reigned for 178 years.

Ramessês XII. and Herihor. The Great Papyrus Harris (time of Ramessês III.) describes the anarchy between Dynasties XIX. and XX.: see Breasted, *Anc. Rec.* iv. § 398.

A revised list of Dynasty XX. is given by Newberry in Elliot Smith and Warren Dawson, *Egyptian Mummies*, 1924: see also T. E. Peet in *J. of Eg. Arch.* xiv. (1928), pp. 52 f.

(c) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

From the Third Book of Manetho.

The Twentieth Dynasty consisted of twelve kings of Diospolis, who reigned for 172 years.

DYNASTY XXI.

Fr. 58 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Twenty-first Dynasty¹ consisted of seven kings of Tanis.

1. Smendês,² for 26 years.
2. Psusen(n)ês [I.],³ for 46 years.
3. Nephhercherês (Nephelecherês), for 4 years.
4. Amenôphthis, for 9 years.
5. Osochôr, for 6 years.
6. Psinachês, for 9 years.
7. Psusennês [II.] (Susennês), for 14 years.

Total, 130 years.⁴

¹ For Smendês or Nesbenebde, a local noble of Tanis, who seized the whole Delta and made himself king of Lower Egypt, see *C.A.H.* ii. p. 191; iii. pp. 253 f.

² In Egyptian, Psusennês is Psukhê'mnê, "the star appearing in Thebes". In 1939-40 tombs of certain kings of Dynasties XXI. and XXII. were excavated by P. Montet at Tanis, the most valuable being the intact tomb of Psusennês I., with its rich funerary equipment: in several chambers sarcophagi, vases of many kinds, and jewels were found, including the funerary outfit of Amenôphthis (Amon-em-apt, son of Psusennês I.) and the silver sarcophagus of a certain Sesonchôsis (not the first king of Dynasty XXII.), (*Ann. Serv. Antiq.*, tt. xxxix. f., 1939-40).

³ Actual total of items, 114 years. Eusebius is probably correct with 41 years for 2nd king and 35 years for 7th (Meyer).

Fr. 59 (a). Syncellus, p. 139. ΚΑΤΑ ΕΥΣΕΒΙΟΝ.

Εἰκοστὴ πρώτη δυναστεία βασιλέων Τανιτῶν
ἑπτά.

α' Σμένδης, ἔτη κς'.

β' Ψουσέννης, ἔτη μα'.

γ' Νεφερχερής, ἔτη δ'.

δ' Ἀμενωφθίς, ἔτη θ'.

ε' Ὅσοχώρ, ἔτη ς'.

ς' Ψιναχῆς, ἔτη θ'.

ζ' Ψουσέννης, ἔτη λε'.

Ὅμοῦ, ἔτη ρλ'.

(b) EUSEBIUS, *Chronica* I. (Armenian Version),
p. 103.

Vicesima prima dynastia Tanitarum regum VII.

Smendis, annis XXVI.

Psusennes, annis XLI.

Nephercheres, annis IV.

Amenophthis, annis IX.

Osochor, annis VI.

Psinnaches, annis IX.

Psusennes, annis XXXV.

Summa annorum est CXXX.

Fr. 59 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-first Dynasty consisted of seven kings
of Tanis.

1. Smendis, for 26 years.
2. Psusennês, for 41 years.
3. Nephhercherês, for 4 years.
4. Amenôphthis, for 9 years.
5. Osochôr, for 6 years.
6. Psinachês, for 9 years.
7. Psusennês, for 35 years.

Total, 130 years.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-first Dynasty consisted of seven kings
of Tanis.

1. Smendis, for 26 years.
2. Psusennês, for 41 years.
3. Nephhercherês, for 4 years.
4. Amenôphthis, for 9 years.
5. Osochôr, for 6 years.
6. Psinnaches, for 9 years.
7. Psusennes, for 35 years.

Total, 130 years.

DYNASTY XXII.

Fr. 60 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Twenty-second Dynasty¹ consisted of nine kings of Bubastus.

1. Sesônychis, for 21 years.
2. Osorthôn,² for 15 years.
- 3, 4, 5. Three other kings, for 25 [29] years.
6. Takelôthis, for 13 years.
- 7, 8, 9. Three other kings, for 42 years.
- Total, 120 years.³

Fr. 61 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-second Dynasty consisted of three kings of Bubastus.

1. Sesônychôsis, for 21 years.
2. Osorthôn, for 15 years.
3. Takelôthis, for 13 years.
- Total, 49 years.

p. 58. The first king, Sesonchôsis (Shishak, *O.T. 1 Kings* xiv. 25, 2 *Chron.* xii.) overthrew the Tanites c. 940 B.C. About 930 B.C. he captured Jerusalem and plundered the Temple of Solomon: see Peet, *Egypt and the Old Testament*, 1922, pp. 158 ff. Albright (*The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible* ², 1932-3, p. 199), dates the conquest of Judah by Shishak between 924 and 917 B.C.

² The name Osorthôn is another form of Osorchô (Dynasty XXIII. No. 2—Africanus), the Egyptian Osorkon.

³ Actual total of items, 116 years.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-second Dynasty consisted of three kings of Bubastus.

1. Sesônychôsis, for 21 years.
2. Osorthôn,¹ for 15 years.
3. Tacelôthis, for 13 years.

Total, 49 years.

DYNASTY XXIII.

Fr. 62 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Twenty-third Dynasty² consisted of four kings of Tanis.

1. Petubatês, for 40 years: in his reign the Olympic festival³ was first celebrated.
2. Osorchô, for 8 years: the Egyptians call him Hêraclês.*
3. Psammûs, for 10 years.
4. Zêt,⁴ for 31 years (34).

Total, 89 years.

³ The date of the first Olympic festival was conventionally fixed at 776-775 B.C.

* See G. A. Wainwright, *Sky-Religion*, pp. 35 f.

⁴ The fact that the name Zêt, occurring in Africanus alone, is wrapped in obscurity, has led Flinders Petrie to suggest ("The Mysterious Zêt" in *Ancient Egypt*, 1914, p. 32) that the three Greek letters are a contraction for ζητέω or other word connected with ζητέω, meaning "A question (remains)," or "Query, about 31 years": for 31 years at this time no single ruler seemed to be predominant, and further search was needed to settle who should be entered as the king of Egypt. "Zêt." is found in wall-inscriptions at Pompeii: see Diehl, *Pompeianische Wandinschriften*, No. 682. The next inscription, No. 683, gives "Zêtêma" in full: a riddle follows.

Fr. 63 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-third Dynasty consisted of three kings of Tanis.

1. Petubastis,¹ for 25 years.
 2. Osorthôn, for 9 years : the Egyptians called him Hêraclês.
 3. Psammûs, for 10 years.
- Total, 44 years.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-third Dynasty consisted of three kings of Tanis.

1. Petubastis, for 25 years.
 2. Osorthon, whom the Egyptians named Hercules : for 9 years.
 3. Psammus, for 10 years.
- Total, 44 years.

¹ For a demotic romance of the time of Petubastis in one of the Rainer Papyri, see Krall in *Vienna Oriental Journal*, xvii. (1903), 1 : it is also found in papyri of Paris and Strassburg. Parallels may be drawn between this romance and Manetho ; cf. Spiegelberg, *Der Sagenkreis des Königs Petubastis* (Leipzig, 1910), pp. 8 f.

DYNASTY XXIV.

Fr. 64 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Twenty-fourth Dynasty.¹

Bochchôris of Saïs, for 6 years : in his reign a lamb² spoke³ . . . 990 years.

Fr. 65 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-fourth Dynasty.

Bochchôris of Saïs, for 44 years : in his reign a lamb spoke. Total, 44 years.⁴

βασιλείον δράκοντα ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ πτερωτόν, (Suidas adds, ἔχοντα μῆκος πήχεων δ'), καὶ τῶν βασιλέων τινὶ λελάληκε τὰ μέλλοντα. ("The lamb has spoken to you. Egyptians have recorded a lamb speaking with a human voice [or, in Egypt, they say, a lamb spoke with a human voice]. It was found to have upon its head a royal winged serpent [4 cubits in length]; and it foretold the future to one of the kings.") See Meyer, *Ein neues Bruchstück Manethos über das Lamm des Bokchoris* in *Zeitschr. für Ägypt. Sprache*, xlv. (1910), pp. 135 f. : he points out the Egyptian character of the description—the royal *uraeus*, four cubits long, with ostrich feathers on both sides. Cf. Weill, *La fin du moyen empire égyptien*, pp. 116, 622.

³ Here some essential words have been omitted from the text.

⁴ Contrast the "6 years" assigned to Bocchoris by Africanus (Fr. 64) : it is suspicious that Eusebius should give 44 years for each of Dynasties XXIII., XXIV., and XXV.

AEGYPTIACA (EPITOME) FR. 65, 66, 67

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-fourth Dynasty.

Bocchoris of Saïs, for 44 years : in his reign a lamb spoke.

DYNASTY XXV.

Fr. 66 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Twenty-fifth Dynasty¹ consisted of three Ethiopian kings.

1. Sabacôn,² who, taking Bochchôris captive, burned him alive, and reigned for 8 years.
2. Sebichôs, his son, for 14 years.
3. Tarcus, for 18 years.

Total, 40 years.

Fr. 67 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-fifth Dynasty consisted of three Ethiopian kings.

1. Sabacôn, who, taking Bochchôris captive, burned him alive, and reigned for 12 years.
2. Sebichôs. his son, for 12 years.
3. Taracus, for 20 years.

Total, 44 years.

Bochchoris was treated like a mock king in the ancient festival, the burning ceremonially destroying his kingly character. See Wainwright, *Sky-Religion*, pp. 38 ff.

¹ Taharka : in *O.T. 2 Kings* xix. 9, Tirhakah, King of Ethiopia. See Peet, *Egypt and the Old Testament*, 1922, pp. 175 ff.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-fifth Dynasty consisted of three Ethiopian kings.

1. Sabacon, who, taking Bocchoris captive, burned him alive, and reigned for 12 years.

2. Sebichos, his son, for 12 years.

3. Saracus (Taracus), for 20 years.

Total, 44 years.

DYNASTY XXVI.

Fr. 68 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Twenty-sixth Dynasty¹ consisted of nine kings of Saïs.

1. Stephinatês, for 7 years.

2. Nechepsôs, for 6 years.

3. Nechaô, for 8 years.

4. Psammêtichus,² for 54 years.

5. Nechaô³ the Second, for 6 years: he took Jerusalem, and led King Iôachaz captive into Egypt.

6. Psammuthis the Second, for 6 years.

² Psammêtichus I. (Psametik) = Psammêtk, "man, or vendor, of mixed wine," cf. Herodotus, ii. 151 (Griffith in *Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the Rylands Library*, iii. pp. 44, 201). See Diod. Sic. i. 66, 67.

³ Nechaô is an old name, an Egyptian plural form, "belonging to the *kas*" or bulls (Apis and Mnevis), *O.T.* 2 *Chron.* xxxvi. 2-4. Battle of Megiddo, 609 B.C.: defeat and death of King Josiah by Necho (2 *Kings* xxiii. 29, xxiv. 1, xxv. 26). Jehoahaz, son of Josiah, was led captive into Egypt. For these events, see Peet, *Egypt and the Old Testament*, 1922, p. 181 ff.

ζ' Οὐαφρις, ἔτη ιθ', ᾧ προσέφυγον ἀλούσης
ὑπὸ Ἀσσυρίων Ἱερουσαλήμ οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων
ὑπόλοιποι.

η' Ἀμωσις, ἔτη μδ'.

θ' Ψαμμεχερίτης, μῆνας σ'.

Ὅμοῦ, ἔτη ρν' καὶ μῆνας σ'.

FR. 69 (a). Syncellus, p. 143. ΚΑΤΑ ΕΥΣΕΒΙΟΝ.

Ἔκτη καὶ εἰκοστὴ δυναστεία Σαῦτῶν βασιλέων θ'.

α' Ἀμμέρις Αἰθίοψ, ἔτη ιβ'.

β' Στεφινάθις, ἔτη ζ'.

γ' Νεχεψώς, ἔτη σ'.

δ' Νεχαώ, ἔτη η'.

ε' Ψαμμήτιχος, ἔτη μέ'.¹

ς' Νεχαὼ δεύτερος, ἔτη σ'. οὗτος εἶλε τὴν
Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ Ἰωάχαζ τὸν βασιλέα
αἰχμάλωτον εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀπήγαγε.

ζ' Ψάμμουθις ἕτερος, ὁ καὶ Ψαμμήτιχος, ἔτη
ιζ'.

¹ μδ' Müller.

¹ Uaphris or Apries, in Egyptian Wahibprē', the Hophra of the O.T. Capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, 587 B.C. See Peet, *op. cit.* pp. 185 ff.

7. Uaphris,¹ for 19 years: the remnant of the Jews fled to him, when Jerusalem was captured by the Assyrians.
 8. Amôsis,² for 44 years.
 9. Psammecheritês,³ for 6 months.
- Total, 150 years 6 months.

Fr. 69 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-sixth Dynasty consisted of nine kings of Saïs.

1. Ammeris the Ethiopian, for 12 years.
2. Stephinathis, for 7 years.
3. Nechepsôs, for 6 years.
4. Nechaô, for 8 years.
5. Psammêtichus, for 45 [44] years.
6. Nechaô the Second, for 6 years: he took Jerusalem, and led King Iôachaz captive into Egypt.
7. Psammuthis the Second, also called Psammêtichus, for 17 years.

² Amôsis should be Amasis (Ia'h'mase), the general of Uaphris or Apries: Amasis was first made co-regent with Apries (569 B.C.), then two years later, after a battle, he became sole monarch.

On the character of Amasis, "the darling of the people and of popular legend," see the demotic papyrus translated by Spiegelberg, *The Credibility of Herodotus' Account of Egypt* (trans. Blackman), pp. 29 f.

³ Psammêtichus III., defeated by Cambysês the Persian, 525 B.C. The three Psametiks are differentiated as Psammêtichus, Psammuthis, and Psammecheritês (cf. Fr. 20, n. 1).

η' Οὐαφρις, ἔτη κέ', ᾧ προσέφυγον ἀλούσης
 ὑπὸ Ἀσσυρίων τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ οἱ τῶν
 Ἰουδαίων ὑπόλοιποι.

θ' Ἀμωσις, ἔτη μβ'.

Ὅμοῦ, ἔτη ρξγ'.

(b) EUSEBIUS, *Chronica* I. (Armenian Version),
 p. 104.

Vicesima sexta dynastia Saïtarum regum IX.

Ameres Aethiops, annis XVIII.

Stephinathes, annis VII.

Nechepsos, annis VI.

Nechao, annis VIII.

Psametichus, annis XLIV.

Nechao alter, annis VI. Ab hoc Hierosolyma
 capta sunt, Iochasusque rex in Aegyptum
 captivus abductus.

Psamuthes alter, qui et Psammetichus, annis
 XVII.

Uaphres, annis XXV, ad quem reliquiae Iudae-
 orum, Hierosolymis in Assyriorum potestatem
 redactis, confugerunt.

Amosis, annis XLII.

Summa annorum CLXVII.

8. Uaphris, for 25 years: the remnant of the Jews fled to him, when Jerusalem was captured by the Assyrians.
9. Amôsis, for 42 years.
- Total, 163 years.¹

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-sixth Dynasty consisted of nine kings of Saïs.

1. Ameres the Ethiopian, for 18 years.
2. Stephinathes, for 7 years.
3. Nechepsos, for 6 years.
4. Nechao, for 8 years.
5. Psametichus, for 44 years.
6. Nechao the Second, for 6 years: he took Jerusalem, and led King Ioachaz captive into Egypt.
7. Psamuthes the Second, also called Psammetichus, for 17 years.
8. Uaphres, for 25 years: the remnant of the Jews took refuge with him, when Jerusalem was subjugated by the Assyrians.
9. Amosis, for 42 years.
- Total, 167 years.

¹ If 44 years are assigned to (5) Psammêtichus, the actual total is 167, as in the Armenian Version.

DYNASTY XXVII.

Fr. 70 (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO AFRICANUS.

The Twenty-seventh Dynasty¹ consisted of eight Persian kings.

1. Cambysês in the fifth year of his kingship over the Persians became king of Egypt, and ruled for 6 years.
2. Darius, son of Hystaspês, for 36 years.
3. Xerxês the Great, for 21 years.
4. Artabanus,² for 7 months.
5. Artaxerxês,³ for 41 years.
6. Xerxês,⁴ for 2 months.
7. Sogdianus, for 7 months.
8. Darius, son of Xerxês, for 19 years.

Total, 124 years 4 months.

gives 6½ years: to the Magi, 7½ months. The conquest of Egypt is assigned to the fourth year of Cambysês' reign, and it was in that year that the campaign began. Artaxerxês is described as "the son" (*i.e.* of Xerxês); while Darius II. is correctly named "the Illegitimate". See Bilabel's note on the papyrus (*l.c.*).

² Artabanus, vizier, and murderer of Xerxês I., 465 B.C.

³ Artaxerxês I., "Long-hand" ("whether from a physical peculiarity or political capacity is uncertain," *C.A.H.* vi. p. 2), 465-424 B.C.

⁴ Xerxês II. was murdered by his half-brother Sogdianus, who was in turn defeated and put to death in 423 B.C. by another half-brother Ochus (Darius II., nicknamed Nothos, "the Illegitimate,"), not "son of Xerxês". Darius II. died in 404 B.C.

Fr. 71 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-seventh Dynasty consisted of eight Persian kings.

1. Cambysês in the fifth year of his kingship became king of Egypt, and ruled for 3 years.
 2. Magi, for 7 months.
 3. Darius, for 36 years.
 4. Xerxês, son of Darius, for 21 years.
 5. Artaxerxês of the long hand, for 40 years.
 6. Xerxês the Second, for 2 months.
 7. Sogdianus, for 7 months.
 8. Darius, son of Xerxês, for 19 years.
- Total, 120 years 4 months.

(b) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-seventh Dynasty consisted of eight Persian kings.

1. Cambyses in the fifth¹ year of his kingship became king of Egypt, and ruled for 3 years.
 2. Magi, for 7 months.
 3. Darius, for 36 years.
 4. Xerxes, son of Darius, for 21 years.
 5. Artaxerxês, for 40 years.
 6. Xerxês the Second, for 2 months.
 7. Sogdianus, for 7 months.
 8. Darius, son of Xerxes, for 19 years.
- Total, 120 years 4 months.

¹ The Armenian text has "15th".

DYNASTY XXVIII.

Fr. 72 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
AFRICANUS.

The Twenty-eighth Dynasty.¹ Amyrteos of Sais,
for 6 years.

(b) ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-eighth Dynasty. Amyrtaeus of Sais,
for 6 years.

(c) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-eighth Dynasty. Amyrtes of Sais,
for 6 years.²

DYNASTY XXIX.

Fr. 73 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
AFRICANUS.

The Twenty-ninth Dynasty:³ four kings of
Mendês.

1. Nephritês, for 6 years.
2. Achôris, for 13 years.
3. Psammuthis, for 1 year.
4. Nephritês [II.], for 4 months.

Total, 20 years 4 months.

² 6 years (Aucher, Karst): 6 months (Müller). The Armenian words for "month" and "year" are so similar that corruption is likely (Margoliouth).

³ Dynasty XXIX., resident at Mendês in E. Delta (Baedeker⁶, p. 183), 398-381 B.C. On the sequence of these rulers see H. R. Hall in *C.A.H.* vi. p. 145 and n.

(b) ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-ninth Dynasty: four kings¹ of Mendês.

1. Nephéritês, for 6 years.
 2. Achôris, for 13 years.
 3. Psammuthis, for 1 year.
 4. Nephéritês [II.], for 4 months.
 5. Muthis, for 1 year.
- Total, 21 years 4 months.

(c) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Twenty-ninth Dynasty consisted of four kings of Mendes.

1. Nepherites, for 6 years.
 2. Achoris, for 13 years.
 3. Psamuthes, for 1 year.
 4. Muthes, for 1 year.
 5. Nepherites [II.], for 4 months.
- Total, 21 years and 4 months.

¹ Muthis or Muthês was a usurper, hence the number of kings is given as four. He is unknown to the Monuments. Aucher suggests that the name Muthis may be merely a repetition, curtailed, of the name Psammuthis.

DYNASTY XXX.

Fr. 74 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
AFRICANUS.

The Thirtieth Dynasty ¹ consisted of three kings of Sebennytus.

1. Nectanebês, for 18 years.
2. Teôs, for 2 years.
3. Nectanebus,² for 18 years.

Total, 38 years.

(b) ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Thirtieth Dynasty consisted of three kings of Sebennytus.

1. Nectanebês, for 10 years.
2. Teôs, for 2 years.
3. Nectanebus, for 8 years.

Total, 20 years.

Chronol. des Manetho, pp. 334 f. Under Olymp. 107 (*i.e.* 352-348 B.C.) Jerome (*Chronicle*, p. 203 Fotheringham, p. 121 Helm) notes: Ochus Aegyptum tenuit, Nectanebo in Aethiopiam pulso, in quo Aegyptiorum regnum destructum est. Huc usque Manethos. ("Ochus possessed Egypt, when he had driven Nectanebô into Ethiopia: thereby the kingship of the Egyptians was destroyed. So far Manetho [or, Here ends the History of Manetho]").

²For the later renown of this king as magician in popular legend, see the *Dream of Nectonabô*s, in Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, i. pp. 369 ff.

(c) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Thirtieth Dynasty consisted of 3 kings of Sebennytus.

1. Nectanebis, for 10 years.
 2. Teos, for 2 years.
 3. Nectanebus, for 8 years.
- Total, 20 years.

DYNASTY XXXI.

Fr. 75 (a) (*from Syncellus*). ACCORDING TO
AFRICANUS.

The Thirty-first Dynasty¹ consisted of three Persian kings.

1. Ôchus in the twentieth year² of his kingship over the Persians became king of Egypt, and ruled for 2 years.
2. Arsês, for 3 years.
3. Darius, for 4 years.

Total of years in Book III., 1050 years³ [850].

Here ends the *History* of Manetho.

(an error for 30) Dynasties of Egypt down to the time of Ôchus and Neectanebô": although mistaken about the number of the Dynasties, Syncellus is in the main correct.

² The 20th year of the kingship of Ôchus was 343 B.C.: the phrase is parallel to that used in Fr. 70, I, and appears therefore to be Manetho's expression.

³ The totals given by Africanus in Book III. are 135, 130, 120, 89, 6, 40, 150 +, 124 +, 6, 20 +, 38, i.e. 858 + years. To reduce to 850, assign 116 years to Dynasty XXII. (as the items add), and 120 to Dynasty XXVII. (Meyer).

(b) ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS.

The Thirty-first Dynasty consisted of three Persian kings.

1. Ôchus in the twentieth year of his kingship over the Persians conquered Egypt, and ruled for 6 years.
2. His successor was Arsês, son of Ôchus, who reigned for 4 years.
3. Next, Darius reigned for 6 years: he was put to death by Alexander of Macedon.

These are the contents of the Third Book of Manetho.

Here ends the *History* of Manetho.

(c) ARMENIAN VERSION OF EUSEBIUS.

The Thirty-first Dynasty consisted of Persian kings.

1. Ochus in the twentieth year of his kingship over the Persians seized Egypt and held it for 6 years.
2. His successor was Arsês, son of Ochus, who reigned for 4 years.
3. Next, Darius reigned for 6 years: he was put to death by Alexander of Macedon.

These are the contents of the Third Book¹ of Manetho.

THE SACRED BOOK.

Fr. 76 (*from* EUSEBIUS).

Now the whole history of Egypt and especially the details of Egyptian religion are expounded at length in Greek by Manetho the Egyptian, both in his *Sacred Book* and in other writings of his.

(*From* THEODORETUS.)

Manetho rehearsed the stories of Isis, Osiris, Apis, Serapis, and the other gods of Egypt.

Fr. 77 (*from* PLUTARCH, *Is. and Osir.*, ch. 9).

Further, the general belief is that the name Amûn,¹ which we transform into Ammôn, is an Egyptian proper noun, the title of Zeus²; but Manetho of Sebennytus is of opinion that this name has a meaning—"that which is concealed" and "concealment."

Fr. 78 (*from* PLUTARCH, *Is. and Osir.*, ch. 49).

Some say that Bebôn³ was one of the comrades of Typhôn; but Manetho states that Typhôn himself

¹The title Zeus Ammôn was already known to Pindar in the first half of the fifth century B.C. (*Pythians*, iv. 16, Fr. 36; see Pausanias, ix. 16, 1).

²The name "Bebôn," given to Typhôn, does not mean "prevention," but is the Egyptian *b'by*, an epithet of Sêth. In Greek, besides the form *Béβων*, *Báβυς* was used (Hellicus in Athenaeus, xv. 25, p. 680a). Typhôn, an unpopular deity, came into favour in Dynasty XIX., two kings of which were Sethôs I. and II.

was also called *Bebôn*. The name means "checking" or "prevention," and implies that, when actions are proceeding in due course and tending to their required end, the power of *Typhôn* obstructs them.

FR. 79 (*from* PLUTARCH, *Is. and Osir.*, ch. 62).

The usage of the Egyptians is also similar. They often call *Isis* by the name of *Athena*, which expresses some such meaning as "I came from Myself,"¹ and is indicative of self-originated movement. But *Typhôn*, as I have already mentioned, is called *Sêth*, *Bebôn*, and *Smy*,² these names implying a certain violent and obstructive force, or a certain opposition or overthrow. Further, as *Manetho* records, they call the loadstone "the bone of *Hôrus*," but iron "the bone of *Typhôn*."³ Just as iron is often like to be attracted and led after the stone, but often again turns away and is repelled in the opposite direction. so the

¹ *Smy* is not a name of *Typhôn*, but may mean "confederate" in Egyptian (from *sm*¹, to unite). In religious texts the phrase *Sêth* and his *sm¹yt*, i.e. "*Sêth* and his confederates," often occurs. See *Kees on Sêth in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, R.-E.* ii. A. 2 (1923), cols. 1896 ff.

² Interesting confirmation of the correctness of *Plutarch* and *Manetho* is given by *G. A. Wainwright* in his article "Iron in Egypt" (*J. Ég. Arch.* xviii. 1932, p. 14). He compares *Pyramid Texts*, § 14, "the *bî*" which came forth out of *Setesh*," and refers to *Petrie's* discovery at *Ḳâw* (an important centre of *Sêth* worship) of great quantities of gigantic bones, collected in piles: they were chiefly of hippopotami,—mineralized, heavy, black bones, of metallic lustre and appearance. It is clear that they were considered sacred to *Sêth*, as they were wrapped in linen and were found here and there in tombs at *Ḳâw*.

salutary, good, and rational movement of the world at one time attracts, conciliates, and by persuasion mollifies that harsh Typhonian power; then again, when the latter has recovered itself, it overthrows the other and reduces it to helplessness.

FR. 80 (*from* PLUTARCH, *Is. and Osir.*, ch. 28).

Ptolemy Sôtêr dreamed that he saw the colossal statue¹ of Pluto at Sinôpê,² although he did not know what manner of shape it had, having never previously seen it; and that it bade him convey it with all possible speed to Alexandria. The king was at a loss and did not know where the statue stood; but as he was describing the vision to his friends,

J. Eg. Arch. xi. (1925), p. 182). Only the Greek statue by Bryaxis was brought from Sinôpe: the cult was organized in Egypt itself, and Serapis became the paramount deity of Alexandria with a magnificent temple in Rhakôtis. If there were forty-two temples of Serapis in Egypt (Aristides, viii. 56, 1, p. 96 Dind.)—this number being one for each nome, the majority have left no trace: Parthey (*op. cit.* pp. 216 f.) identifies eleven.

See Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dichtung*, i. p. 154, Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, Intro. pp. 77 ff. (a full discussion of the origin of the cult of Serapis). *Cf.* also Rostovtzeff in *C.A.H.* vii. pp. 145 f.

For the dream as a vehicle of religious propaganda, *cf.* P. Cairo Zenon 34 (258-257 B.C.: see Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, pp. 152 ff.), and *Inscr. Gr.* xi. 4, 1299 (c. 200 B.C.).

² In the districts by the Black Sea, a great god of the underworld was worshipped; and this deity, as Rostovtzeff holds, must be set in close connexion with the Alexandrine Serapis. See Julius Kaerst, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*², ii. (1926), pp. 246 f., and *cf.* the late Roman coins of Sinôpe with the Serapis-type (Plate IV, No. 3).

there came forward a far-travelled man, by name Sôsibius, who declared that at Sinôpe he had seen just such a colossus as the king had dreamt he saw. He therefore despatched Sôtêlês and Dionysius, who after a long time and with difficulty, though not unaided by divine providence, stole away the statue. When it was brought to Egypt and exhibited there, Timotheus¹ the *exégétés* (expounder or interpreter), Manetho² of Sebennytus, and their colleagues, judging by the Cerberus and the serpent, came to the conclusion that it was a statue of Pluto; and they convinced Ptolemy that it represented no other god than Serapis. For it had not come bearing this name from its distant home, but after being conveyed to Alexandria, it acquired the Egyptian name for Pluto, namely Serapis.

Fr. 81 (*from* AELIAN).

I am told also that Manetho the Egyptian, who attained the acme of wisdom, declared that one who tastes sow's milk is infected with leprosy or scall. All Asiatics, indeed, loathe these diseases. The Egyptians hold that the sow is abhorred by both Sun and Moon; so, when they celebrate the annual festival in honour of the Moon, they sacrifice swine³ to the goddess, whereas at any other time they refuse to sacrifice this animal to the Moon or to any other deity.

² Manetho's connexion with the Serapis cult is vouched for by a bust in the Serapeum at Carthage, *Corpus Inscr. Lat.* viii. 1007: see Intro. p. xv.

³ Cf. Herodotus, ii. 47, and see Newberry in *J. Eg. Arch.* xiv. p. 213.

AN EPITOME OF PHYSICAL DOCTRINES

AN EPITOME OF PHYSICAL DOCTRINES.

Fr. 82 (*from* DIOGENES LAERTIUS).

The Egyptians hold the Sun and the Moon to be gods, the former being named Osiris, the latter Isis. They refer darkly to them under the symbols of beetle, serpent, hawk, and other creatures, as Manetho says in his *Epitome of Physical Doctrines*.

Fr. 83 (*from* EUSEBIUS).

The Egyptians say that Isis and Osiris are the Moon and the Sun ; that Zeus is the name which they gave to the all-pervading spirit, Hephaestus to fire, and Demeter to earth. Among the Egyptians the moist element is named Ocean and their own River Nile ; and to him they ascribed the origin of the Gods.¹ To Air, again, they give, it is said, the name of Athena. Now these five deities,—I mean Air, Water, Fire, Earth, and Spirit,—traverse the whole world, transforming themselves at different times into different shapes and semblances of men and creatures of all kinds. In Egypt itself there have also been born mortal men of the same names as these deities :

θεῶν γενέσεις ὑπάρξαι). See also Plutarch, *Is. et Osir.* 66, p. 377 C. The name Νεῖλος appears first in Hesiod, *Theogony* 338, which may be dated to the eighth century B.C.

In a *Hymn to the Nile*, engraved upon the rocks at Gebel Silsileh in Upper Egypt by command of Ramessês II., the river is described as "the living and beautiful Nile, . . . father of all the gods" (Wiedemann, *Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, pp. 146 f.).

ON ANCIENT RITUAL AND RELIGION

they were called Hêlios, Cronos, Rhea, as well as Zeus, Hêra, Hêphaestus, and Hestia. Manetho writes on this subject at considerable length, while Diodorus gives a concise account. . . .

ON FESTIVALS.

Fr. 84 (*from* JOANNES LYDUS).

It must be understood that Manetho in his book *On Festivals*¹ states that a solar eclipse exerts a baneful influence upon men in their head and stomach.

ON ANCIENT RITUAL AND RELIGION.

Fr. 85 (*from* PORPHYRIUS).

The rite of human sacrifice² at Hêliopolis (Eileithyiaspolis)³ in Egypt was suppressed by Amôsis,⁴

Tiberius, wrote an account of human sacrifice in Egypt (Athen. iv. p. 172*d*), and there is evidence for the sacrifice of captives in Dynasties XVIII. and XIX. See Diod. Sic. i. 88, 5, and *cf.* Frazer, *Golden Bough*, ii. pp. 254 ff.

Some writers have suggested that the contracted human figure (the *tekenu*), wrapped in a skin and drawn on a sledge, who is a regular feature of funeral processions in the New Kingdom, may have been a remnant of human sacrifice. This, however, is very doubtful: *cf.* N. de G. Davies, *Five Theban Tombs*, pp. 9, 14. See further G. A. Wainwright, *Sky-Religion*, pp. 33 f.

³ See Fr. 86. The mention of Hêra (see *infra*) makes it very probable that "Eileithyiaspolis" is the correct reading here.

⁴ Amôsis, c. 1570 B.C.

ON ANCIENT RITUAL AND RELIGION

as Manetho testifies in his book *On Ancient Ritual and Religion*.¹ Men were sacrificed to Hêra : they were examined, like the pure calves which are sought out and marked with a seal. Three men used to be sacrificed each day ; but in their stead Amôsis ordered that the same number of waxen images should be offered.

Fr. 86 (*from* PLUTARCH, *Is. and Osir.*, ch. 73).

Now many say that the soul of Typhôn himself is diffused among these animals ; and this fable would seem to hint that every irrational and bestial nature is partaker of the evil spirit, and that, while seeking to conciliate and appease him, men tend and worship these animals. Should a long and severe drought² occur, bringing with it an excess of deadly diseases or other strange and unaccountable calamities, the priests lead off some of the sacred animals quietly and in silence under cover of darkness, threatening them at first and trying to frighten³ them ; but, should of the temple of Hathor, and will cause the sky to split in the middle), No. VIII. B (the Book of Banishing an Enemy, also dated c. 1200 B.C., containing threats to tear out the soul and annihilate the corpse of Osiris, and set fire to every tomb of his), and *The Attitude of the Ancient Egyptians to Death and the Dead*, 1935, pp. 12, 16 f., 39, note 17.

Threats to the gods also appear later in the Greek papyri : see L.C.L., *Select Papyri*, i. (Hunt and Edgar), pp. 309, 345, Th. Hopfner, *Griechisch-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber* (= *Stud. zur Pal. und Pap.*, Wessely, xxiii. 1924), §§ 187, 210 *et al.*, and cf. Porphyrius, *Epistula ad Anebonem*, 27, who remarks that this is peculiarly Egyptian. See Wilcken, *Chrestomathie*, i. 1, pp. 124 f. ("perhaps a remnant of ancient fetishism").

the visitation continue, they consecrate the animals and slaughter them, intending thus to inflict a kind of chastisement upon the spirit, or at least to offer a great atonement for heinous offences. Moreover, in Eileithyiaspolis,¹ as Manetho has related, they used to burn men alive, calling them "Typhôn's followers"; and their ashes they would winnow and scatter broadcast until they were seen no more. But this was done openly and at a set time, namely in the dog-days; whereas the consecrations of sacred animals are secret ceremonies, taking place at irregular intervals as occasion demands, unknown to the common people except when the priests celebrate a funeral of Apis, and, displaying some of the animals, cast them together into the tomb in the presence of all, deeming that thus they are vexing Typhôn in return and curtailing his delight.

ON THE MAKING OF KYPHI.

FR. 87 (*from* PLUTARCH, *Is. and Osir.*, ch. 80).

Kyphi² is a mixture of sixteen ingredients—honey, wine, raisins, cyperus [? galingale], resin, myrrh,

Recipes of a similar nature have been found at Edfu (two) and at Philae (one): they were inscribed in hieroglyphs on temple-walls. Kyphi had a double use—as incense and as medicine. See further Ganszyniec in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *R.-E.* (1924). Parthey (*Isis und Osiris*, pp. 277 ff.) describes the results of experiments with the recipes of Plutarch, of Galen (also sixteen ingredients), and of Dioscorides (ten ingredients): he gives first place to the kyphi prepared according to the prescription of Dioscorides.

aspalathus,¹ seselis [hartwort]; mastic, bitumen, thryon [a kind of reed or rush], dock [monk's rhubarb], as well as of both junipers (arceuthids—one called the greater, the other the less), cardamom,² and reed [orris-root, or root of sweet flag].

[CRITICISMS OF HERODOTUS]

Fr. 88³ (from the *Etymologicum Magnum*).

The word λέων ("lion") comes from λάω, "I see": the animal has indeed the keenest of sight, as Manetho says in his *Criticism of Herodotus* that the lion never sleeps.⁴ But this is hard to believe.

Choeroboscus, in his work *On Orthography* (iv./v. A.D.), gives the derivation of λέων according to Ōrus or Hōrus in almost the same words as those quoted above from the *Etymologicum Magnum*; but he omits the clause "as Manetho says in his *Criticism of Herodotus*" (Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*, ii. p. 235, ll. 32 ff. = *Etymologicum Genuinum*).

Cf. Aelian, *On the Nature of Animals*, v. 39: "the Egyptians, they say, boast about this, adding that the lion is superior to sleep, being always awake." Aelian quotes from Apion (see p. 19 n. 3), who may well have taken his statement from Manetho.

¹ By a curious coincidence, in Egyptian also the words for "lion" (*m'ī*) and "to see" (*m'*) are very similar, and the word for "lion" is sometimes written as though it came from the verb "to see". Manetho possibly had this fact in mind when he stated that the lion never sleeps (Battiscombe Gunn).

(From EUSTATHIUS.)

(Some say) that from *λάω*, "I see," comes not only *λέων*, but also *λῖς* (a lion), according to Ôrus the grammarian,¹ because of its keen sight; and they add, as Manetho states in his *Criticisms of Herodotus*, that the lion never sleeps. This is hard to believe.

¹ Ôrus or Hôrus (v. A.D.) was, according to Suidas, an Alexandrian grammarian who taught at Constantinople: none of his numerous works is extant.

APPENDIX I.

PSEUDO-MANETHO.

(*From* SYNCELLUS).

It remains now to make brief extracts concerning the dynasties of Egypt from the works of Manetho of Sebennytus. In the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus he was styled high-priest of the pagan temples of Egypt, and wrote from inscriptions in the Sêriadic land,¹ traced, he says, in sacred language and holy characters by Thôth,² the first Hermês, and translated after the Flood . . . in hieroglyphic characters. When the work had been arranged in books by Agathodaemôn, son of the second Hermês³ and father of Tat, in the temple-shrines of Egypt, Manetho dedicated it to the above King Ptolemy II. Philadelphus in his *Book of Sôthis*, using the following words :

³ The second Hermês is Hermês Trismegistus, the teacher.

For a discussion of the whole passage, see W. Scott, *Hermetica*, iii. pp. 492 f. He pointed out manifest breaches of continuity after χρηματίσας (end of l. 4) and after Αἰγύπτου (end of l. 12). If the intervening 8 lines are cut out (ἐκ τῶν . . . Αἰγύπτου), the sentence runs smoothly; and Scott suggested that these 8 lines originally stood in Manetho's letter after ἀ μαθον. Even with this insertion there still remains a gap before ἐπὰ βιβλία, but apart from that lacuna, the whole becomes intelligible.

Letter of Manetho of Sebennytus to Ptolemy Philadelphus.

“To the great King Ptolemy Philadelphus Augustus.¹ Greeting to my lord Ptolemy from Manetho, high-priest and scribe of the sacred shrines of Egypt, born at Sebennytus and dwelling at Héliopolis. It is my duty, almighty king, to reflect upon all such matters as you may desire me to investigate. So, as you are making researches concerning the future of the universe, in obedience to your command I shall place before you the Sacred Books which I have studied, written by your forefather, Hermês Trismegistus.² Farewell, I pray, my lord King.”

Such is his account of the translation of the books written by the second Hermês. Thereafter Manetho tells also of five Egyptian tribes which formed thirty dynasties . . .

(Fr. 2, p. 11, follows directly after this.)

A MS. of Celsus gives a list of medical writers, Egyptian or Greek and Latin: they include (col. 1, ll. 9-13) Hermês Trismegistus, Manetho (MS. *emmanetos*), Nechepsô, Cleopatra regina. Here Manetho is followed by Nechepsô, to whom, along with Petosiris (perhaps another name of Nechepsô), works on astrology were attributed in the Second Century B.C.: see W. Kroll and M. Pieper in *R.-E.* xvi. 2 (1935), *s.v.* Nechepsô.

APPENDIX II.

ERATOSTHENES (?) (*From Syncellus*).

Fr. 7 (a).

Kings of Thebes.¹

Apollodorus, the chronographer, recorded another dynasty of Egyptian kings,—the Thebans, as they are called,—thirty-eight kings ruling for 1076 years. This dynasty began in Anno Mundi 2900, and came to an end in Anno Mundi 3045 [3976]. The knowledge of these kings, he says, Eratosthenes took from Egyptian records and lists, and at the king's command he translated them into the Greek language, as follows :

Of the Theban kings in thirty-eight dynasties ruling 1124 years after the Dispersion,

containing thirty-eight kings, who ruled for 1076 years, is of Theban origin, derived from a Royal List such as that of Karnak : the explanations of the names are interesting, and the variations in Nos. 11 and 15 may be due to the priests themselves. Historically the list is of no great worth : several of the names are not proper names, but Throne-names, such as are found in the Royal Lists and the Turin Papyrus (Meyer, *Aeg. Chron.* pp. 99 ff.).

Kings 1-5 correspond to Dynasty I., 13-17 to Dynasty IV., 18-22 to Dynasty VI.

1. The first was Mênês of Thebes, whose name, being interpreted, means "everlasting".¹ He reigned for 62 years. Anno mundi 2900.
2. The second king of Thebes was Athôthês, son of Mênês, for 59 years. His name, being interpreted, means "Born of Hermês".² Anno mundi 2962.
3. The third king of Thebes in Egypt was Athôthês II., for 32 years. Anno mundi 3021.
4. The fourth king of Thebes was Miabaês, son of Athôthis, for 19 years. His name, being interpreted, means "Bull-lover".³ Anno mundi 3053.
5. The fifth king of Thebes was Pemphôs (? Sempsôs, Semempsês), son of Athôthis. His name is "descendant of Hêraclês," and he reigned for 18 years. Anno mundi 3072.

Fr. 13.

6. The sixth king of Thebes in Egypt was Momcheiri of Memphis, reigning for 79 years. His name, being interpreted, means

¹ The Egyptian form of the name Mênês may quite well be interpreted as "the abiding one," from *mn*, "to endure".

² This etymology obviously assumes the presence of the divine name Thôth in the name Athôthês.

³ The first element of the name Miabaês is clearly some form of the verb *mr*, "to love".

“leader of men”. He had exceeding large limbs (and was therefore irresistible). Anno mundi 3090.

7. The seventh king of Thebes in Egypt was his son, Stoichos. The name means “unfeeling Arês”. He reigned for 6 years. Anno mundi 3169.
8. The eighth king of Thebes in Egypt was Gosormiês, whose name means “all-demanding”. He reigned for 30 years. Anno mundi 3175.
9. The ninth king of Thebes in Egypt was his son, Marês, whose name means “gift of the Sun”.¹ He reigned for 26 years. Anno mundi 3205.
10. The tenth king of Thebes in Egypt was Anôÿphis, whose name means “revelling”.² He reigned for 20 years. Anno mundi 3231.
11. The eleventh king of Thebes in Egypt was Sirius, whose name means “son of the iris of the eye,”³ or, as others say, “unharméd by the evil eye”. He reigned for 18 years. Anno mundi 3251.
12. The twelfth king of Thebes in Egypt was Chnubos or Gneuros, which means “gold”⁴

line 32, A. Vogliano, *Madinet Madi, Primo Rapporto* (1936): see note on No. 35 *infra*, p. 224.

² Possibly this explanation is based upon the Egyptian word *unóf*, “to rejoice” (B.G.).

³ In Egyptian *si-îri* means “son of the eye”.

⁴ *Núb* is Egyptian for “gold”.

or "golden son" (or his son). He reigned for 22 years. Anno mundi 3269.

13. The thirteenth king of Thebes in Egypt was Raÿôsis, which means "the arch-masterful".¹ He reigned for 13 years Anno mundi 3291.
14. The fourteenth king of Thebes in Egypt was Biÿrês, who reigned for 10 years. Anno mundi 3304.

Fr. 17.

15. The fifteenth king of Thebes in Egypt was Saôphis, "reveller," or, according to some, "money-getter, trafficker". He reigned for 29 years. Anno mundi 3314.
16. The sixteenth king of Thebes was Saôphis II, who reigned for 27 years. Anno mundi 3343.
17. The seventeenth king of Thebes was Moscherês (? Mencherês), "gift of the Sun," who reigned for 31 years. Anno mundi 3370.
18. The eighteenth king of Thebes was Mosthês (? Mencherês II.), who reigned for 33 years. Anno mundi 3401.
19. The nineteenth king of Thebes was Pammês, "leader-like," who reigned for 35 years. Anno mundi 3434.

¹ Possibly, according to this explanation, Ra- (or Rha-) is the Egyptian *hry*, "master," and the rest of the name **wôse(r)*, "powerful" (B.G.).

Fr. 22.

20. The twentieth king of Thebes was Apappûs (Pepi),¹ "the very great". He, they say, ruled for 100 years all but one hour. Anno mundi 3469.
21. The twenty-first king of Thebes was Echeskosokaras, for 1 year. Anno mundi 3569.
22. The twenty-second ruler of Thebes was Nitôcris,² a queen, not a king. Her name means "Athêna the victorious," and she reigned for 6 years. Anno mundi 3570.

Fr. 33.

23. The twenty-third king of Thebes was Myrtaeus (Amyrtaeus), "gift of Ammôn,"³ for 22 years. Anno mundi 3576.
24. The twenty-fourth king of Thebes was Uôsimarês, "Mighty is the Sun,"⁴ for 12 years. Anno mundi 3598.
25. The twenty-fifth king of Thebes was Sethinilus (Thirillus), which means "having increased his ancestral power," for 8 years. Anno mundi 3610.

¹ Apappûs is the Phiôps of Fr. 20. 4, with a curious misunderstanding of his reign of 94 years.

² See p. 54 n. 2, and Wainwright, *Sky-Religion*, pp. 41, 45.

³ This interpretation is based upon the common Egyptian name Amenerdais, "Amûn has given him".

⁴ The Egyptian *Wôse-mi-Rê* means "Mighty like the Sun": Uôsimarês may however be intended for the first half of the *praenomen* of Ramessês II., *Wese-mê-Rê*, but this means "Rê is mighty in justice" (B.G.).

26. The twenty-sixth king of Thebes was Semphrucatês, which means "Heraclês Harpocratês," for 18 years. Anno mundi 3618.
27. The twenty-seventh king of Thebes was Chuthêr, "bull-lord,"¹ for 7 years. Anno mundi 3636.
28. The twenty-eighth king of Thebes was Meurês (Mieirês), "loving the iris of the eye,"² for 12 years. Anno mundi 3643.
29. The twenty-ninth king of Thebes was Chômaephtha (Tômaephtha), "world, loving Hêphaestus,"³ for 11 years. Anno mundi 3655.
30. The thirtieth king of Thebes was Soicunius (or Soicunis), † hochotyrannos, †⁴ (or Soicuniosochus the lord), for 60 years. Anno mundi 3666.
31. The thirty-first king of Thebes was Peteathyrês,⁵ for 16 years. Anno mundi 3726.

Fr. 37.

32. The thirty-second king of Thebes was <Stammenemês I. (Ammenemês I.), for 26 years. Anno mundi 3742.

³ As to the latter part of the name, "loving Hêphaestus" is in Egyptian *mai-Ptah*: the emended Tô- represents the Egyptian *tô*, "world" (B.G.).

⁴ Bunsen emends this *vox nihili* to mean "a tyrant like Ôchus": Gutschmid, to mean "Suchus the lord". The latter description may refer to one of the Sebekhotpes.

⁵ Peteathyrês, a well-formed name *Pedo-hathor*, which does not occur as a king's name.

33. The thirty-third king of Thebes was> Stamenemês II. (Ammenemês II.), for 23 years. Anno mundi 3768.
34. The thirty-fourth king of Thebes was Sistosichermês, "valiant Hêraclês" (Sistosis or Sesortôsis, "valiant Hermês or Hêraclês"), for 55 years. Anno mundi 3791.
35. The thirty-fifth king of Thebes was Marês,¹ for 43 years. Anno mundi 3846.

Fr. 40.

36. The thirty-sixth king of Thebes was Siphthas,² also called Hermês, "son of Hêphaestus," for 5 years. Anno mundi 3889.
37. The thirty-seventh king of Thebes was Phruorô³ (Phuorô) or "the Nile," for 5 (? 19) years. Anno mundi 3894.
38. The thirty-eighth king of Thebes was Amuthartaeus, for 63 years. Anno mundi 3913.

[Syncellus then adds (p. 279) in much the same phrase as that quoted at the beginning of Appendix II.: "These names Eratosthenes took from the sacred scribes at Diospolis and translated from Egyptian into the Greek language."]

the pentameter is to scan. [See note on p. 50. The temple at the vestibule of which the Hymn was inscribed is dated 95 B.C.]

² Siphthas is King Siptah ("son of Ptah"), probably Thuôris (Thuôris), of Dynasty XIX.

³ The Egyptian name for the River Nile is *p-yeor-o*. For comparisons of the King of Egypt with the River Nile, see Grapow, *Die Bildlichen Ausdrücke des Aegyptischen*, p. 62.

APPENDIX III.

THE OLD CHRONICLE.

(*From Syncellus*).

Now, among the Egyptians there is current an old chronography,¹ by which indeed. I believe, Manetho² has been led into error.

In 30 dynasties with 113 generations, it comprises an immense period of time [not the same as Manetho gives] in 36,525 years,³ dealing first with the Aeritae,⁴ next with the Mestraei, and thirdly with the Egyptians. Its contents are somewhat as follows:—

Dynasties of the Gods according to the Old Chronicle.

Hêphaestus has no period assigned, because he shines night and day. Hêlios [the Sun], son of

less than the total given in the text. The number of generations, 113, is obtained by counting 1 for Dynasty XXVIII. and 7 for XXIX. This vast world-period of 36,525 years is 25 times the Sôthic period of 1461 calendar years (or 1460 Sôthic years): see *infra*, and for the Sôthic period, Intro. pp. xxix f.

¹ Aeritae and Mestraei are really the same as the third race, the Egyptians, the three names apparently referring to Egypt at three different dates. Aeria is an old name of Egypt (Euseb., *Chron.* in Syncellus, p. 293, Armenian Version (Schöne, p. 30), *Aegyptus quae prius Aeria dicebatur* . . .). Mestraei (Josephus, *Antiq.* l. 6. 2)—from Mestraim (p. 7 n. 2).

Hêphaestus, ruled for 30,000 years. Then Cronos (it says) and the remaining gods, 12 in number, reigned altogether for 3984 years. Next, the eight demi-gods were kings for 217 years; and after them 15 generations of the Sôthic Cycle are recorded with 443 years.¹

Then follow :

The Sixteenth Dynasty of Kings of Tanis, in 8 generations, for 190 years.

The Seventeenth Dynasty of Kings of Memphis, in 4 generations, for 103 years.

The Eighteenth Dynasty of Kings of Memphis, in 14 generations, for 348 years.

The Nineteenth Dynasty of Kings of Diospolis, in 5 generations, for 194 years.

The Twentieth Dynasty of Kings of Diospolis, in 8 generations, for 228 years.

The Twenty-first Dynasty of Kings of Tanis, in 6 generations, for 121 years.

The Twenty-second Dynasty of Kings of Tanis, in 3 generations, for 48 years.

The Twenty-third Dynasty of Kings of Diospolis, in 2 generations, for 19 years.

The Twenty-fourth Dynasty of Kings of Saïs, in 3 generations, for 44 years.

The Twenty-fifth Dynasty of Ethiopian Kings, in 3 generations, for 44 years.

The Twenty-sixth Dynasty of Kings of Memphis, in 7 generations, for 177 years.

¹ This total comes, not from the *Book of Sôthis* which gives 395 for the first 15, but from Eratosthenes (App. II.). A smaller total than Manetho's 3357 years was desired in order to shorten the duration of the historical age of Egypt.

The Twenty-seventh Dynasty of Persian Kings, in 5 generations, for 124 years.

[The Twenty-eighth Dynasty is here omitted—one king of Sais reigning for 6 years.]

Then comes the Twenty-ninth Dynasty of Kings of Tanis in <7> generations for 39 years ; and finally the Thirtieth Dynasty consists of one King of Tanis for 18 years. The sum total of all the 30 Dynasties comprises 36,525 years.

If this total is broken up, or divided, 25 times into periods of 1461 years, it reveals the periodic return of the Zodiac which is commonly referred to in Egyptian and Greek books, that is, its revolution from one point back to that same point again, namely, the first minute of the first degree of the equinoctial sign of the Zodiac, the Ram as it is called by them, according to the account given in *The General Discourses of Hermês* and in the *Cyranides*.

Hence it was, I suppose, that Claudius Ptolemaeus¹ announced that the ready astronomical tables should be calculated in periods of 25 years . . .

Hence, too, the lack of harmony between such systems and our Holy Scriptures, as well as between one system and another, may be explained by the fact that this Egyptian record, which is held to be of great antiquity, assigns an immense period to Hêphaestus, and to the remaining 29² Dynasties 36,525 years, although Hêphaestus ruled over Egypt

¹ Claudius Ptolemaeus, the famous mathematician, astronomer, and geographer, c. A.D. 100-178: for his *Ready Tables* see p. 5 in the other section of this volume.

² An obviously incorrect summary of the enumeration of Dynasties given above.

many years after the Flood and the Building of the Tower, as will be shown in the appropriate place.

The illustrious Egyptian Manetho, writing of these same 30 Dynasties, and obviously taking this as his starting-point, is widely divergent thereafter in the dates he gives, as one may learn both from what I have already said above, and from the remarks that will follow immediately. For in his three books, 113 generations are recorded in 30 Dynasties, and the time which he assigns amounts in all to 3555 years, beginning with Anno mundi 1586 and ending with 5147 [5141], or some 15 years before the conquest of the world by Alexander of Macedon.

If therefore one subtracts from this total the 656 years before the Flood in order to make up [with 1586] the 2242 years from Adam to the Flood,—these 656 years being regarded as falsely assigned or non-existent,—and the 534 years from the Flood to the Building of the Tower, the Confusion of Tongues, and the Dispersion of the Peoples, one will clearly find the rise of the kingdom of Egypt under the first Egyptian king, Mestraïm, who is by Manetho called Mênês, which began in the year 2776, the year of Adam, and continued down to Nectanabô, the last king of Egypt. Thus the sum total from Mestraïm down to this Nectanabô is 2365 years, which takes us, as has already been stated, to Anno mundi 5147 [5141], approximately 15 years before the rule of Alexander the Founder.

²1. ,ερμα'.

³,ερμα', marginal note in Goar.

APPENDIX IV.

THE BOOK OF SÔTHIS¹ OR THE SÔTHIC CYCLE.

(*From Syncellus.*)

The years of the kings of Egypt, called Mestraea of old.

1. Mestralm, also called Mênês, 35 years.
2. Kourôdês, 63 years.
3. Aristarchus, 34 years.
4. Spanius, 36 years.
- 5 and 6. Two kings, unrecorded, 72 years.
7. Ôsiropis, 23 years.
8. Sesonchôsis, 49 years.
9. Amenemês, 29 years.
10. Amasis, 2 years.
11. Acesephthrês, 13.
12. Anchoreus, 9 years.
13. Armîysês, 4 years.

third century after Christ. It is not possible to divide the kings of this "Cycle" into dynasties, for their sequence is unchronological: *e.g.* 18-24 belong to Dynasties XIX. and XX., 26-29, 32 to the Hyksôs period, 33-48 to Dynasty XVIII., 49, 58 to Dynasty XIX., 50, 51 to Dynasty XXVI., 59-61 to Dynasty I., 63-67 to Dynasty XXI., 68-70 to Dynasty XXIII., 74 to Dynasty XXIV., 75-77 to Dynasty XXV., and 79-86 to Dynasty XXVI.

The *Book of Sôthis* includes names taken from another source than Manetho.

14. Chamoïs,¹ 12 years.
15. Miamûs, 14 years.
16. Amesêsis, 65 years.
17. Usês, 50 years.
18. Ramesês, 29 years.
19. Rames(s)omenês, 15 years.
20. Usimarê(s),² 31 years.
21. Ramessêseôs,³ 23 years.
22. Ramessamenô, 19 years.

He is the first Pharaoh mentioned in the Holy Scriptures. In his reign the patriarch Abraham went down into Egypt.⁴

23. Ramessê Iubassê, 39 years.
24. Ramessê, son of Uaphrês,⁵ 29 years.
25. Concharis, 5 years.

In this 5th year of Concharis, the 25th king of Egypt, during the Sixteenth

² The name Usimarê(s) is the first part of the *praenomen* of Ramessês II. : see p. 221 n. 4.

³ It is tempting to see in this name the Egyptian *Ramesese-o*, "Ramessês the Great," although this term, so commonly used in modern times, is not found in Egyptian records (B.G.).

⁴ On Abraham's descent into Egypt, see Poet, *Egypt and the Old Testament*, 1922, pp. 47 ff. (Abraham went down into Egypt in the First Intermediate Period, during Dynasties VII.-X., and left Egypt before 2081 B.C.) Sir L. Woolley, on the other hand, is satisfied with the traditional date of the birth of Abraham at Ur, c. 2000 B.C. ; but he believes that the patriarch was not a single man, but a composite character (Abram, Abraham)—see *Abraham : Recent Discoveries and Hebrew Origins*, 1936.

⁵ This description "son of Uaphrês" is a remarkable anachronism : a king of Dynasty XIX. or XX. is said to be the son of a king of Dynasty XXVI.

Dynasty of the Sôthic Cycle as it is called in Manetho, the total of years from the first king and founder of Egypt, Mestraïm, is 700 belonging to 25 kings, *i.e.* from the general cosmic year 2776, in which the Dispersion took place in the 34th year of the rule of Arphaxad¹ and the 5th year of Phalec.² Next in the succession were 4 kings of Tanis, who ruled Egypt in the Seventeenth Dynasty for 254 [259] years, according to the following computation.

26. Silitês (the first of the 6 kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty in Manetho), 19 years.
27. Baiôn, 44 years.
28. Apachnas, 36 years.
29. Aphôphis, 61 years.

Some say that this king was at first called Pharaoh, and that in the 4th year of his kingship Joseph came as a slave into Egypt.³ He appointed Joseph lord of Egypt and all his kingdom in the 17th year of his rule, having learned from him the interpretation of the dreams and having thus proved his divine wisdom.

¹ Arphaxad, son of Shem: *O.T. Genesis* x. 22. See p. 26 n. 1.

² Phalec or Peleg (= division): "for in his days was the earth divided" (*Genesis* x. 25). Cf. the name of the town Phaliga on the Euphrates,—not that the patriarch Peleg is to be connected directly with this town (W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*², 1932-3, p. 210).

³ For the Sojourn in Egypt during the Hyksôs period, see Peet, *Egypt and the Old Testament*, pp. 73 ff.; Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*², pp. 143 f.; Garstang, *The Heritage of Solomon*, 1934, p. 147.

The Holy Scriptures, however, give the name of Pharaoh also to the king of Egypt in the time of Abraham.

30. Sethôs, 50 years.

31. Cêrtôs, according to Josephus, 29 years;
according to Manetho, 44 years.

32. Asêth, 20 years.

This king added the 5 intercalary days to the year : ¹ in his reign, they say, the Egyptian year became a year of 365 days, being previously reckoned as 360 days only. In his time the bull-calf was deified and called Apis.

33. Amôsis, also called Tethmôsis, 26 years.

34. Chebrôn, 13 years.

35. Amemphis, 15 years.

36. Amensês, 11 years

37. Misphragmuthôsis, 16 years.

38. Misphrês, 23 years.

39. Tuthmôsis, 39 years.

40. Amenôphthis, 34 years.

This is the king who was reputed to be Memnôn and a speaking statue. Many

¹ See p. 99 n. 3.

¹ B : 'Αμεμφής A.

years later Cambysês, the Persian king, cut this statue in two, deeming that there was sorcery in it, as Polyænus of Athens¹ relates.

The Ethiopians, removing from the River Indus, settled near Egypt.

41. Ôrus, 48 years.
42. Achencherês, 25 years.
43. Athôris, 29 years.
44. Chencherês, 26 years.
45. Acherrês, 8 or 30 years.
46. Armaeus, also called Danaus, 9 years.

This king, fleeing from his brother Ramessês, also called Aegyptus, was driven from his kingdom of Egypt and came to Greece. Ramessês, his brother, whose other name was Aegyptus, ruled Egypt for 68 years, changing the name of his country to Egypt after his own name. Its previous name was Mestraea, and among the Greeks Aeria. Now Danaus or Armaeus took possession of Argos and, driving out Sthenelus the son of Crotôpus, ruled over the Argives. His descendants thereafter were called Danaïdæ down to Eurystheus son of Sthenelus, the son of Perseus. Next to these, after Pelops the Pelopidæ succeeded to the kingdom: the first of these was Atreus.

¹ Polyænus of Athens (? of Sardis or of Macedonia), a writer of history, lived in the time of Gaius (Caligula).

47. Ramessês, also called Aegyptus, 68 years.
48. Amenôphis, 8 years.
49. Thuôris, 17 years.
50. Nechepsôs,¹ 19 years.
51. Psammuthis, 13 years.
52. —, 4 years.
53. Cêrtôs,² 20 years.
54. Rampsis, 45 years.
55. Amensês, also called Ammenemês, 26 years.
56. Ochyras, 14 years.
57. Amendês, 27 years.
58. Thuôris, 50 years.

This is the Polybus of Homer, who appears in the *Odyssey* as husband of Alcandra : the poet tells how Menelaus and Helen dwelt with him in their wanderings after the capture of Troy.

59. Athôthis, also called Phusanus,³ 28 years.

In his reign earthquakes occurred in Egypt, although previously unknown there.

60. Cencenês, 39 years.
61. Uennephis, 42 years.

¹ See p. 211 n. 2. Nechepsôs appears again as Nechepsus, No. 80.

² 53-58 may be the 6 kings of Dynasty XIX., some of them repeated. 53 Cêrtôs may be Sethôs : 54 Rampsis = 47 Ramessês : 55 Amensês = Amenmesês : while Thuôris appears as 58 and 49.

³ With Phusanus cf. Psusennês of Dynasty XXI.

62. Susakeim,¹ 34 years.

This king brought up Libyans, Ethiopians, and Trôglodytes² before Jerusalem.

63. Psuenus, 25 years.

64. Ammenôphis, 9 years.

65. Nephecherês, 6 years.

66. Saîtês, 15 years.

67. Psinachês, 9 years.

68. Petubastês, 44 years.

69. Osôrthôn, 9 years.

70. Psammus, 10 years.

71. Concharis, 21 years.

72. Osôrthôn, 15 years.

73. Tacalôphis, 13 years.

74. Bocchôris, 44 years.

This king made laws for the Egyptians :
in his time report has it that a lamb spoke.³

75. Sabacôn, an Ethiopian, 12 years.

This king, taking Bocchôris captive,
burned him alive.⁴

76. Sebêchôn, 12 years.

¹ Susakeim, apparently, is Shoshenk, or Sesonchôsis, the first king of Dynasty XXII. (Fr. 60, 1): Josephus, *Antiq.*, viii. § 210, has Susakos.

² In *O.T.* 2 *Chron.* xii. 3 it is said that Shishak brought up, along with the Ethiopians, the Lubims (Libyans) and the Sukkiims : in the LXX the last are the Trôglodytes, *i.e.* the " Cave-dwellers " along the west shore of the Red Sea (see Strabo, xvi. 4. 17). G. W. Murray, *Sons of Ishmael*, 1935, p. 18, suspects that the Ethiopians were negro troops or perhaps Beja nomads (*i.e.* Bedouin). " At any rate Shishak, like the great Mohammed Ali after him, realized the importance of Bedouin auxiliaries on a desert campaign."

³ See p. 164 n. 2.

⁴ See p. 166 n. 2.

77. Taracês, 20 years.
78. Amaês,¹ 38 years.
79. Stephinathês, 27 years.
80. Nechepsus, 13 years.
81. Nechaô, 8 years.
82. Psammêtichus, 14 years.
83. Nechaô II. (Pharaoh), 9 years.
84. Psamuthês the Second, also called Psammêti-
 chus, 17 years.
85. Uaphris, 34 years.
86. Amôsis, 50 years.

¹ Amaês corresponds to Ammeris or Amcres the Ethiopian, Fr. 69, 1, *i.e.* Tanutamûn, Dynasty XXVI.



CHAP. II.

MANETHO.

ON the overthrow of the Persian Empire, and the foundation of the Græco-Syrian and Egyptian kingdoms, it was natural that the conquerors should show some curiosity about the antiquities of those nations with which their own race was to blend: and under kings who founded the library of Alexandria, and drew to it the most learned men of Greece, such as Demetrius Phalereus, Eratosthenes, and Apollodorus, and caused the sacred books of the Jews, settled in multitudes in their capital, to be translated, it was not likely that any long time would pass before some member of the Egyptian priesthood, master of both languages, would offer to his sovereign, in Greek, a detailed account of the national religion, philosophy, and history. This was done by Manetho, a native of Sebennys, one of the chief priests at Heliopolis, who is said to have dedicated his *Αἰγυπτιακὰ* (probably about B.C. 276) to Ptolemy Philadelphus, a little after Berosus, under similar circumstances and influences, had dedicated his *Χαλδαϊκὰ*, in three books, to Antiochus *Θεός*. Berosus was advanced in age when he wrote, as he had lived, according to his own account, under Alexander the Great; and after the death of Alexander he had travelled and resided in Greece: and Manetho, though younger, seems to have been already at the head of the Egyptian priesthood under Ptolemy Lagi, if, as is probable, the Manetho of Sebennys consulted about the image of Pluto brought from Pontus and identified with Serapis be the same as the historian. (*Plutarch De Is.*, c. 28.) It is supposed that Manetho had the work of Berosus before him when he wrote, (Syn-

cellus says he wrote *κατὰ μίμησιν Βηρώσσου*,) so that he may have borrowed from it, and may have made his own work purposely parallel with it, or counter to it, in some details.

Besides being acquainted with the Chaldaica of Berosus, Manetho, according to the opinion of Africanus, adopted by Eusebius, followed to a certain extent "the Chronicle," (the oldest thing of the kind extant in the Greek language,) though he varied much from it, both in his sums of years and in other details.

The work of Manetho established its author as the chief and most copious authority on the subjects of which he treated, just as Berosus had become the great authority on Chaldaean antiquities. But though this was so, and though his name is extolled by later writers when Egyptian history is mentioned, it seems that, from some cause or other, his genuine work was superseded about the time of the Christian era by an abridged and altered edition, which still went under his name. From an Egyptian list compiled by Eratosthenes, but copied by Syncellus from Apollodorus, and from a notice taken by Syncellus no doubt from the same source, that "the chronographer had collected from Manetho" a certain sum of the years of the Kings to Nectanebo or Alexander, we see that the genuine work of Manetho was still extant, and no other mentioned, as late as the year B.C. 141, when Apollodorus ended his chronography. But Diodorus, who was in Egypt in the time of Ptolemy surnamed *Νέος Διόνυσος*, Ol. 180, B.C. 60, makes no mention of Manetho: and Josephus, writing against Apion at Rome under Domitian, quotes with such emphasis from "*Manetho himself*," as perhaps to imply that the Manetho then most known, and quoted by his adversary Apion and by others, was not the original, and that it was only recently, and owing to a special cause, that he had himself become acquainted with the genuine text. For a fire having consumed the Portico of Octavia with its library, the Emperor Domitian, no great patron of learning at other times, showed, as Suetonius relates, an extraordinary zeal for the reparation of this damage, causing duplicates of some books, and fresh copies of others made on purpose, to be brought from different libraries,

especially from the great library of Alexandria, where the genuine work of Manetho himself had been originally deposited, and was certainly preserved, and whence a copy of it, or even the original itself, was then in consequence brought to Rome. Plutarch and Ælian, who also quote the genuine Manetho, became acquainted with him no doubt through the same accident as Josephus, as they too are known to have been at Rome. But in the East itself we have no clear mention of the genuine Manetho later than the time of Apollodorus. And already in the first century of the Christian era Tatian, a Christian writer born in Babylonia, when touching on Egyptian history in such a way as to make one expect that he is about to name Manetho, names *not* Manetho but another writer, Ptolemy of Mendes, as the great authority on this subject:—“*Αἰγυπτίων δὲ εἰσὶν ἀκριβεῖς χρόνων ἀναγραφαὶ, καὶ τῶν κατ’ αὐτοὺς γραμμάτων ἑρμηνεύς Πτολεμαῖος, οὐχ ὁ βασιλεὺς, ἱερεὺς δὲ Μένδητος.*” (*Euseb. Præp. Ev.*, x. 12.) And then, after quoting him for the synchronism of Amosis, Moses, and Inachus, he adds that *Apion* also, the same writer against whom Josephus was writing at Rome when he quoted with such emphasis Manetho himself, follows Ptolemy of Mendes, being, as it would seem, not long after his time:—“*Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Ἀπίων ὁ γραμματικὸς, ἀνὴρ δοκιμώτατος, ἐν τῇ δ’ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν... φησὶ δ’ ὅτι κατέσκαψε τὴν Αὔαριν ὁ Ἀμωσις, κατὰ τὸν Ἀργεῖον γενόμενος Ἰναχον, ὡς ἐν τοῖς Χρόνοις [Χρονικοῖς?] ἀνέγραψεν ὁ Μενδήσιος Πτολεμαῖος.*” But if Apion, who was himself by birth an Egyptian, and the author of a work entitled like that of Manetho *Αἰγυπτιακά*, quoted not Manetho, but Ptolemy, this agrees well with the language of Tatian, who says that in his time Ptolemy was the great authority. What is still wanting is, first, something to show more distinctly that the work of Ptolemy was in fact an abridgment and re-edition of Manetho; and then further, something to explain how it came to pass that the genuine work of Manetho himself should have been so little circulated and so completely supplanted even in Egypt by a later re-edition.

As to the first point this may help us, that Ptolemy of Mendes is said to have written *Αἰγυπτιακά* in three books,

which so far agrees with the title and division of Manetho ; while Suidas, besides the original "*Μανεθῶ Σεβεννύτης*" of Sebennys, has also another "*Μαναίθως Μένδης*" of Mendes ; the Mendesian Manetho being no doubt Ptolemy. And whereas from the time of Africanus downwards those lists and conjoined notices which he has preserved have been in possession of the name of Manetho, though they show by internal disagreements, and by mentioning both Manetho and other sources, as the Chronicle, that they cannot possibly be the original work of Manetho himself, the same lists of Africanus, by their brief chronicle-like form, answer well to the title *Χρόνοι*, *Χρονικά*, given by Tatian and others to the work of Ptolemy ; the extracts given by Josephus from the original Manetho being in a very different diffuse style. In this too the Manetho of Africanus agrees with the character given to Ptolemy of Mendes, that he marks a number of Greek synchronisms, especially that of Amosis and Inachus, for which Ptolemy is expressly quoted by Apion and Tatian, and by other Christian writers following Tatian : and it is related of Ptolemy that he was exact in his Greek chronology, having profited no doubt by those writings of Eratosthenes, Apollodorus, and others, which were all posterior to the time of the original Manetho. Lastly, it is significant, though not perhaps of itself conclusive, that whereas the two last native dynasties, XXIX and XXX, are in the Chronicle both called *Tanite*, in the Manetho of Africanus the first of them is named, from the native city of Ptolemy, "*Mendesian*," the second, from that of Manetho, "*Sebennyte* ;" though neither the one city nor the other is ever mentioned elsewhere as having been the actual capital or royal residence even for a single reign.

As regards the other question, how the original work of a writer of such note as Manetho came to be superseded by an abridgment and re-edition, we have some grounds at least for a probable conjecture. It seems certain that Manetho, by his myriads of years divided among Gods, Demigods, Heroes, and Kings before and after Menes, had obtained more ridicule than admiration from Greek readers ; and his account not seeming satisfactory, Eratosthenes, the second

librarian at Alexandria, himself the father of Greek chronology, attempted at the king's desire to reduce the dynasties of Manetho to one consecutive series of kings within the limits allowed by the Chronicle. And this he did, *except that* he yielded so far to the priests whom he consulted, as to include within the times of the monarchy those "xv generations and 443 years of the Cynic Cycle" which in the Chronicle were entered between the Demigods and Menes. But all reigns above or beyond these, whether in the Chronicle or in Manetho, he disallowed as antehistorical and fabulous, or as at best only contemporary and subordinate. It may be imagined that this method was not to the taste of the native priesthood, and that they would not accept such an exposition of their history made, with whatever extorted assistance, by a Greek; an exposition, too, which gave no account of many kings who had certainly existed. So, somewhat later, Ptolemy of Mendes (or whoever was the author of the Manetho of Africanus), thinking that the chief stumbling-block for the Greeks lay in the "myriads of years," undertook to explain the origin of these myriads which seemed so incredible, confessing them to be merely months, reducible to one-twelfth of their apparent bulk: but at the same time, as if to compensate for this concession, he not only retained and reasserted, but he even amplified the vast antiquity claimed by Manetho for Egyptian history and civilisation after Menes. And as the Chronicle, which Manetho had plainly used as one of his sources, exhibited both an older and a fuller form of those "myriads of years" which it was now proposed to explain and reduce, and for reduction the larger sum was the most convenient (Manetho having some 6000 or 7000 years less than the Chronicle), it was natural for Ptolemy of Mendes to give an account in his preface of a document which he meant to use. In this way probably it was that Africanus came to find in that re-edition of Manetho which he followed not only lists really extracted from Manetho, with additions and alterations, but also an introduction giving some account of the principle of reduction on which this re-edition of Manetho was based, and of the Chronicle, the sum of which, though departed

.

from by Manetho, was now returned to, and preferred by the writer to that of Manetho himself.

Thus much premised, we shall exhibit from Eusebius and Syncellus all that is certainly from the Manetho of Africanus, omitting what relates to the Chronicle, and to the reduction of those myriads of years which seemed incredible; notices which, though taken no doubt by Africanus from the same *book* with his Manethonian lists, i. e. from its *introduction*, actually name Manetho as not the same but another writer. Neither shall we notice those alterations which Eusebius, for purposes of his own, has made in copying out the lists of Africanus; nor anything which Syncellus may have found only in that latest pseudo-Manetho, the Sothis of Anianus and Panodorus, which he himself chiefly follows. But after placing before the reader in outline the Manetho of Africanus, we shall compare therewith those earlier notices which we have of the original work of Manetho the Sebennyte, and see how far they help us to decompose the later work of Ptolemy, and to reconstruct out of materials afforded by it the outline of the original.

We extract then from Eusebius, as making towards our purpose, the following words and enumerations (*Chron.* l. i. c. 19, 20, *Lat. Vers. ex Armen. Ed. A. Mai.*):

“Here it will be convenient to insert also the Egyptian accounts *from Manetho*, who seems to be the chief authority for that branch of history: [From the

INTRODUCTION

prefixed to the Manetho of Ptolemy of Mendes used by Africanus:]

[I.] “The first *God* of the Egyptians is Vulcan [Phtha];
 From him was the Sun [i. e. Ra];
 After the Sun, Agathodæmon [i. e. Cneph];
 Then Saturn [i. e. Seb],
 Then Osiris,
 Then Typhon, brother of Osiris,
 Lastly Horus, son of Osiris and Isis.

“These *first* reigned over the Egyptians.

[II.] “Then there reigned in succession others [i. e. other

Gods] down to Bytis, in a space of years amounting [for all the Gods together] to . . 13,900.

[Of which 900 are originally full years, equal to 10,800 month-years; and the rest are month-years, equivalent to 1083 full years and 4 months; making together 1983 full years and 4 months.]

[III.] “*After the Gods* reigned Heroes years . . 1255

[IV.] “And again other Kings [also Heroes? or, xxx Kings, Diospolites?] ruled years . . 1817

[V.] “Then other xxx Kings, Memphites, years 1790

[VI.] “Then other x Kings, Thinites, years . . 350

[VII.] “After these there followed a rule (*Dominatio*, dynasty) of Manes and Heroes [or, cvi Kings, Nubians?] during years . . 5813

“The sum [after the Gods] amounts to 11,000 [month] years;” [equal to 916 full years and 8 months:]

“And the whole space of time during which, as the Egyptians say, the Gods, Heroes [i. e. Demigods], and Manes reigned, is reckoned to be 24,900 years.” [Of these 900 only being originally full years, and the rest months, the true sum of full years is 2900.]

“Then follows [i. e. in Africanus] an enumeration of *thirty* Dynasties from Menes to Nectanebo II., which we” (continues Eusebius) “shall give immediately.”

But instead of taking these from Eusebius, who has so altered them, especially the last fifteen or sixteen, that Syncellus imagined he must have used a different “edition” of Manetho from Africanus, we here have recourse to Syncellus.

“Of the dynasties of Egypt *after the Flood*, according to Africanus:” [Africanus understanding those of the Gods and Demigods to belong to the antediluvian world:]

[BOOK I. OF MANETHO,

according to the re-edition of Ptolemy of Mendes, who had thrown back all that related to the vii mythical groups of Gods, Demigods, and Manes, as well as other matter relating to the Old Chronicle, into

an Introduction prefixed to the Three Books.]

“After the Manes and Demigods” [whose dynasties are understood by Africanus to be *after the Flood*, but before Menes], “is reckoned,

"Dyn. I. [VIII.] of VIII Kings; of whom—

1. Menes, a Thinite, first reigned years 62
2. Athotbis, his son, who built the palace at Memphis . 57
3. Kenkenes, his son 31
4. Ouenephes, his son (under whom was a great famine. He first began to build the pyramids at Kochoe) . 23
5. Ousaphaidos, his son [Ousaphaes, *Euseb.*] 20
6. Miebidos, his son (Niebaes, *Euseb.*) 26
7. Semempses, his son, in whose time there was a great plague ["many prodigies, and a very great plague," *Euseb.*] 18
8. Bieneches, his son (Oubienthes, *Euseb.*) 26

"Sum 253 263

[Eusebius introduces this dynasty with some additional words of Africanus, alluding to a plurality of writers instead of one Manetho, thus: "Of whom the first was Menes, a ruler who merited renown; from whom *they* that have registered the kings of each race deduce the succession as follows:—'1. Menes of This, and his descendants, seven in number,' &c."]

"Dyn. II. [IX.] of IX Thinites:

1. Boethus (Bochus, *Euseb.*) in whose time the earth opened near Bubastis, and many perished . . . years 38
2. Kaiechos (Chous, *Euseb.*), in whose time the Bulls Apis at Memphis, and Mnevis at Heliopolis, and the Goat of Mendes, were [first] accounted to be Gods . . . 39

Carried forward 77

Brought forward 77

3. Binothris (Biophis, *Euseb.*), in whose time it was decided that women might reign 47
4. Tlas 17
5. Sethenes 41
6. Chaires 17
7. Nephercheres, in whose time it is related mythically that the Nile ran for eleven days mixed with honey . . . 25
8. Sesochris, whose height was five cubits and three palms 48
9. Cheneres 30

"Sum 302 302

[Syncellus adds] "Sum of Dyn. I. and II. after the Flood, 555 years, κατὰ τὴν β' ἐκδόσιν Ἀφρικανοῦ, according to the second edition of Africanus" [alluding by the word "edition" to his previous designation of the lists of Africanus and Eusebius as "the two principal editions of Manetho." The β' is probably the addition of some copyist, derived from the same source, viz. the previous mention of the two editions τὰς β' ἐκδόσεις, of which that of Africanus was *one*, but *not* the *second*.]

"Dyn. III. [IX.] of IX Memphites:

1. Necherophes (Necherochis, *Euseb.*), in whose time the Libyans revolted, but, panic-struck at a portentous increase of the moon, returned to obedience . . . 28
2. Tosorthrus (Sesorthus, *Euseb.*) This king is regarded as an Esculapius by the Egyptians for his knowledge of medicine; and he introduced the method of building with hewn stone: he also paid attention to writing . . . 29

Carried forward 57

	Brought forward	57
3. Tyreis	7	
4. Mesochris	17	
5. Soyphis	16	
6. Tosertasis	19	
7. Aches	42	
8. Siphouris	30	
9. Kerpheres	26	

"Sum 214 214

[Syncellus adds] "Sum of the three dynasties according to Africanus, 769 years."

"Dyn. IV. [XI.] of VIII Memphites of another lineage :

1. Soris	29
2. Souphis, who built the greatest pyramid, ascribed by Herodotus to Cheops. He was also contemptuous towards the Gods: and he wrote the sacred [i.e. hieratic] book which I bought, as something of great value, when I was in Egypt	63
3. Souphis	66
4. Mencheres	63
5. Ratoises	25
6. Bicheres	22
7. Sebercheres	7
8. Thamphthis	9

"Sum 277 284

[Syncellus made the sum 277, for he adds] "Sum of the four dynasties 1046, according to Africanus."

"Dyn. V. [XII.] of IX kings from Elephantine :

[Perhaps a purposed mistranslation of the Egyptian word <i>Abt</i> , the East, meaning the eastern side of the Nile, or Heliopolis, opposite to Memphis:]	
1. Ousercheres	28
2. Sephres	13

Carried forward 41

	Brought forward	41
3. Nephcheres	20	
4. Sisires	7	
5. Cheres	20	
6. Rathoures	44	
7. Mencheres	9	
8. Tancheres	44	
9. Ounos [or Obnos]	33	

"Sum 248 218

[And Syncellus found 248, for he adds] "Sum, with the 1046 of the four preceding dynasties, 1294 years." [So probably either Sisires had 37, or Mencheres 39.]

"Dyn. VI. [XIII.] of VI Memphites :

1. Othoes, who was slain by his guards	30
2. Phios	53
3. Methou-Souphis	7
4. Phiops, who began to reign at the age of six and reigned to 100	100
5. Menthe-Souphis	1
6. Nitocris, the most courageous and most beautiful woman of her time, of fair complexion (<i>ξανθή</i>), who built the third Pyramid	12

"Sum 203 203

[Syncellus adds] "Sum, with the 1294 of the five dynasties preceding, 1497 years;" [which shows that he cast up 100, and not only 94, for Phiops.]

"Dyn. VII. of LXX Memphites, 70 days.

"Dyn. VIII. of XXVII Memphites, who reigned 146 years.

[The "146" is the genuine reading, though Syncellus must have found 142, for he subjoins], "The sum of the eight dynasties is 1639 years;" [i.e. the 1497 last made + 142.]

" *Dyn. IX. of XIX Heracleopolites, who reigned 409 years; of whom the first, Acthoes, a king more tyrannical than any of his predecessors, did much evil to the people throughout all Egypt, till at last he went mad, and was killed by a crocodile.*

" *Dyn. X. of XIX Heracleopolites, who reigned 185 years.*

" *Dyn. XI. [XIV.] of XVI Diospolites, who reigned 43 years; after whom—*

Ammenemes reigned . . . 16

"Here Manetho ends his *First Book*, containing in all of kings cxcvii, and of years 2300, and 70 days;" [this notice being not, like the sums of the dynasties, from Syncellus, but from Africanus, or even from Ptolemy of Mendes himself.]

"BOOK II. OF MANETHO.

" *Dyn. XII. [XV.] of VII Diospolites :*

1. Sesonchosis, son of Ammenemes 46
2. Ammanemes, who was slain by his own eunuchs . . . 38
3. Sesostris, who in nine years subdued all Asia, and Thrace in Europe, and set up everywhere stelæ as memorials of his reduction of each people, with emblematical signs of manhood or effeminacy, according as they had shown the one or the other; so that this king is accounted by the Egyptians the first [i.e. the greatest] after Osiris . 48
[Eusebius adds, "He is said to have been four cubits three palms and two fingers high;" which seems to be the same notice as Diodorus Siculus attaches to his Rameses-Sesoosis-Sesostris, whose stature was four cubits and four palms.]
4. Lachares [in Eusebius Lammaris or Lampares], who built the Labyrinth in the Arsinoite Nome for his tomb 8
5. Ameres 8
6. Amenemes 8

Carried forward 156

Brought forward 156

7. Scemiophris, sister [of the preceding] 4

"Sum 160 160

" *Dyn. XIII. of LX Diospolites, who reigned 453 years.*

" *Dyn. XIV. [XVI.] of LXXXVI [XXVI, XXX, or XXXVI ?] Xoites [or Diospolites ? Kusites, or Ksoites, i. e. Nubians], who reigned 184 years.*

" *Dyn. XV. [XVII.] of Shepherds. These were VI Phœnician kings*" ["Arabs," i. e. Shasoo, in the Scholiast on Plato, "Peleth-im," i. e. probably Philistine or Pelethite, in Herodotus], who took Memphis: of whom—

1. Saïtes first reigned . . . 19
And from him was named the Saitic Nome [i. e. the Set-ic or Sethroitic, not the Saitic of which Saïs was the capital on the western arm of the Nile]. And these kings built a city in the Sethroite Nome, whence they subdued Egypt.
2. Bnon 44
3. Pachnan 61
4. Staan 50

Carried forward 174

	Brought forward	174
5. Archles		49
6. Aphobis [Aphophis in Eusebius]		61
	"Sum 284	284
[So this is no doubt the true sum of the dynasty in the Manetho of Africanus.]		
"Dyn. XVI. of <i>Shepherds, Greeks</i> [<i>Ἑλληγες</i> , perhaps a purposed mistranslation of the Egyptian designation <i>Hanebou</i> , which in later times is given to the Greeks]; XXXII kings, who reigned years 518.		
"Dyn. XVII. of XLIII other Shepherd kings and XLIII Theban Diospolites. The Shepherds and the Thebans reigned together years 151.		
"Dyn. XVIII. of XVI Diospolite kings; of whom—		
1. Amos "in whose time Moses went out from Egypt," says Africanus, "as we demonstrate;" [to which Syncellus subjoins,] "But, as the reckoning and sum here made force me to say, Moses, in his time, was still quite young." [The 25 years given to this king in the list of Eusebius, are omitted by Syncellus, either through some inadvertence of his own, or owing to some defect in that copy of Africanus from which he transcribes.] [Years omitted . . .]		
2. Chebros		13
3. Amenophthis [Ammenophis, <i>Euseb.</i> , and with only 21 years]		24
4. Amensis or Amessis		22
5. Mispbris [Miphres, <i>Euseb.</i>]		13
6. Mispbragmouthosis (in whose		

Carried forward 72

	Brought forward	72
time was the flood of Deucalion)		26'
7. Touthmosis		9
8. Amenophis [this is the reputed Memnon and the vocal stone]		31
9. Horus		37
10. Acherres		32
11. Rathos		6
12. Chevres		12
13. Acherres		12
14. Armesses		5
15. Ramesses[Σέθως-Ραμεσσης?] 1		
[Then Ramesses II, or "Armesses Miammous," follows in the list copied by Josephus from the original Manetho with 66 years and 2 months; and in the list of Eusebius, copied or altered from Africanus, with 68 years. This long reign, either through his own inadvertence, or rather by some defect in his copy of Africanus, is wanting in the list transcribed by Syncellus . . .]		
16. Amenophath		19
	"Sum 263	262
[It seems, then, that Syncellus made the sum of the dynasty 263 years, though the figures of our present text make by addition only 262.]		
"Dyn. XIX. of VII Diospolite kings:		
1. Sethos, [ὁ καὶ 'Ραμεσσης] reigned years		51
2. Rapsakes ["his eldest son," <i>Joseph.</i>] (<i>Rampses, Euseb.</i>)		61
3. Ammenephthes, or Amenephthes		20
4. Ramesses, or Rameses		60
5. Ammenemes		5
6. Thouoris, called by Homer Polybus, hus-		

Carried forward 197

Brought forward 197
band of Alcandra, in
whose time Troy was
taken . . . 7

"Sum 209 204

"In this second book of Manetho
are kings xcvi, and years 2121."
[This notice is from Africanus, or
from the compiler of his edition of
Manetho.]

BOOK III. OF MANETHO.

"Dyn. XX. of XII Diospolite kings
who reigned years 135.

"Dyn. XXI. of VII Tanite kings:

1. Smendes, reigned years 26
2. Psousennes, or Psousenes 46
3. Nephelcheres [Nepher-
cheres, *Euseb.*] . . . 4
4. Amenophthis . . . 9
5. Osochor . . . 6
6. Psinaches . . . 9
7. Psousennes or Sousesnes 14

"Sum 130 114

"Dyn. XXII. of IX Bubastite kings:

1. Sesonchis [Sesonchosis,
Euseb.] . . . 21
2. Osorthon . . . 15
3. } Other three . . . 25 [29]
4. } Other three . . . 13
5. } Other three . . . 42
6. } Other three . . . 42
7. } Other three . . . 42
8. } Other three . . . 42
9. } Other three . . . 42

"Sum 120 116

"Dyn. XXIII. of IV Tanite kings:

1. Petubates [Petubastes,
Euseb.] . . . 40
2. Osorcho [Osorthon, *Euseb.*], whom the Egyp-
tians call Hercules . . . 8
3. Psammous . . . 10
4. Zet . . . 31

"Sum 89 89

"Dyn. XXIV.

Bocchoris, a Saite (in whose
time a lamb spoke),
reigned years . . . 6

". . . 990 years." [This is no
doubt a note of Africanus, reckoning
probably up from his own time, A.D.
220, to the first Olympiad, and find-
ing that it fell *not* under Bocchoris,
but, as he thought, in the last year
of Petubastes above.]

"Dyn. XXV. of III Ethiopian kings:

1. Sabacon, who took Boc-
choris prisoner and
burned him alive, and
reigned years . . . 8
2. Sebichus, his son . . . 14
3. Tarkos [Tarakos, *Euseb.*] 18

"Sum 40 40

"Dyn. XXVI. of IX Saite kings:

1. Stephinates [Stephina-
this, *Euseb.*, who also
puts first of all "Am-
meris, an Ethiopian,"
with 12 years] . . . 7
2. Nechepsos . . . 6
3. Nechao . . . 8
4. Psammitichus . . . 54
5. Nechao II. (He took
Jerusalem and carried
the king Jehoahaz cap-
tive into Egypt). . . 6
6. Psammouthis or Psam-
mitichus II. . . 6
7. Ouaphris (to whom,
after Jerusalem had
been taken by the
Assyrians, the remnant
of the Jews fled) . . . 19
8. Amosis . . . 44
9. Psammecherites, or Psam-
mach . . . — 6^m.

"Sum 150.6^m 150 6^m.

"Dyn. XXVII. of VIII Persian kings :

1. Cambyses in the fifth year of his reign over the Persians conquered Egypt and reigned over it . 6
2. Darius, son of Hystaspes 36
3. Xerxes the Great . 21
4. Artabanus . . . — 7^m.
5. Artaxerxes . . . 41
6. Xerxes . . . — 2^m.
7. Sogdianus . . . — 7^m.
8. Darius, son of Xerxes . 19

"Sum 124.4^m 124 4^m."

"Dyn. XXVIII. Amyrtæus a Saïte, reigned years 6.

"Dyn. XXIX. of IV Mendesian kings :

1. Nephertites . . . 6
2. Achoris . . . 13
3. Psammouthis . . . 1
4. Nephertites, or Neforotis — 4^m

"Sum 20.4^m 20 4^m."

"Dyn. XXX. of III Sebenwyte kings :

1. Nectanebes, who reigned years . . . 18
2. Teos . . . 2
3. Nectanebos . . . 18

"Sum 38 38"

"Dyn. XXXI of III Persian kings :

1. Ochus in the 20th year of his reign over the Persians conquered Egypt and reigned over it years . 6
2. Arsēs . . . 3
3. Darius . . . 4

13

"Sum of the years of Book III., 1050." "Here Manetho ends." [These two notices are both at least as early as the time of Africanus, whose Manetho as completed and re-edited by Ptolemy of Mendes had not only xxx but xxxi dynasties.]

With this scheme of the Manetho of Africanus, as collected from Eusebius and Syncellus, we have now to confront such earlier notices as refer certainly to the work of the original Manetho.

Now that the original *Αἰγυπτιακά* of Manetho the Sebenwyte were divided into *three books* is a point on which all are agreed; and if he wrote, as Syncellus says he did, "*κατὰ μέγεθιν Βηρώσσου*," in imitation of Berosus, whose *Χαλδαϊκά* were in three books, it was probably this fact that suggested to him a similar distribution of his own work. However this was, Josephus gives us "from Book II." of Manetho a passage containing an account of the Shepherd Kings, and the same list of six names which forms Dyn. XV of Africanus. And this dynasty appears also in Book II. of the Manetho of Africanus, so that even if Josephus did not mention afterwards, as he does, "another book of the same *Egyptiaca*," which from the narrative being connected with

Dyn. XIX seems to be the third, we might infer that the division of the three books marked in the Manetho of Africanus is derived from the original work of the Sebennyte. Only as regards Book III. the sum given for its years, viz. 1050, is inconsistent with the division implied above when the sum of Book II. is put at the end of Dyn. XIX. For if Book III. of the Manetho of Ptolemy and Africanus began with Dyn. XX, it would have only 853, or at most 859 years, to the end of Dyn. XXX, that is, fewer than 1050 by 197 or 191. Besides which we shall see hereafter that if Book II. of the Manetho of Africanus be supposed to include the whole of Dyn. XIX, it will have too many years for the sum of 2121 assigned to it. We may suppose, therefore, that Book III. really began some few years after the commencement of Dyn. XIX; as for instance, if it began from the flight of the brother of Sethos, identified with Danaus, so as to include the times of the "Egyptians," as named from Sethos Egyptus. This peculiarity would then account for the sum of Book II. being put down seemingly too low at the end of the dynasty. In this case Book III. of the original Manetho (who certainly identified Sethos with Egyptus), probably commenced at the same point of Dyn. XIX as Book III. of the Manetho of Africanus, and made about the same sum of 1050 years, there being no reason to suspect any *great* difference for the last twelve dynasties (from XIX to XXX inclusive) properly composing Book III. between the Manetho of Africanus and the original.

Syncellus says of Manetho that "he writes of five Egyptian peoples distributed into XXX Dynasties of Gods, Demi-gods, and Manes, and of mortal men, mentioned also by Eusebius in his Chronicon: "Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ περὶ ἐθνῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν πέντε ἐν λ' δυναστείαις ἱστορεῖ τῶν λεγομένων παρ' αὐτοῖς θεῶν καὶ ἡμιθέων, καὶ νεκύων, καὶ θνητῶν, ὧν καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου μνησθεὶς ἐν τοῖς χρονικοῖς αὐτοῦ φησὶν οὕτως·" κ.τ.λ.

It is true that in this passage he means by Manetho the pseudo-Manetho or Sothis of Anianus and Panodorus; but what he says refers equally and rather to the original Manetho, and to the Manetho of Africanus, which exhibited

Manes and other mythical kings before Menes, whereas the Manetho of the book of Sothis seems to have passed at once from the Demigods to Menes. But however this was, if only the number of dynasties in the three books of the original Manetho be allowed to have been *thirty*, like the number in the Chronicle, (and the latest pseudo-Manetho of Anianus *returns* to this number, not having the thirty-first dynasty of Africanus,) it seems certain that *some* of these XXX dynasties must have contained the Gods, Demigods, Manes, and mythical Kings. Not only in the Chronicle, which Manetho is said to have followed, but in the Turin Papyrus a thousand years older than the Chronicle, in Herodotus, in Diodorus, and everywhere in short, down to the latest pseudo-Manetho of Anianus and Panodorus, we find the Egyptians pretending a *continuous succession* of dynasts and dynasties from Ra, the Sun-god, down to Menes and the living sovereign of the day. Even in the Manetho of Africanus, though the whole number of *thirty* dynasties, derived by the original Manetho from the Chronicle, is given to kings after Menes, and though the earlier groups of Gods, Demigods, Manes, and mythical Kings, are not distinctly numbered as dynasties, words are retained in connection with them which amount to the same thing. And it is easy to see that the author of this scheme, writing between two and three centuries after the Mosaic books had been translated into Greek, meant tacitly to let the earlier dynasties of the original Manetho, the Gods, Demigods, and Manes, stand as a separate series for the times of the old world, as was rightly understood by Africanus; while in compensation for his reduction of their vast periods as from months to real years, he numbered a complete series of thirty postdiluvian dynasties from Menes to Nectanebo II. with a thirty-first added, to cover the years (already mentioned by the original Manetho) between Nectanebo and Alexander. And possibly the spurious letter of Manetho to Ptolemy Philadelphus "*Augustus*" (Σεβαστῶ), and the explanatory hint of antediluvian history having been derived from *stelæ* buried in the land of Assyria, ἐν γῇ Συρίαδι, which Syncellus gives from the later pseudo-Manetho or Sothis, may have belonged

originally to the compilation of Ptolemy of Mendes, since the story has its roots in Berosus, and seems to be alluded to by Josephus in connection with Manetho. But in the time of the original Manetho there was nothing as yet to require any such covert modification of the long-established fable that there had been one unbroken succession of dynasties in Egypt from Ra downwards to Menes and his successors.

Assuming then that the seven groups given by Eusebius from the Manetho of Africanus, and belonging by the very fact that their years are month-years *unreduced* to the original Manetho, are in fact his first VII dynasties, forming part of his first book, but prefixed to the three books as part of a separate Introduction by the compiler to the Manetho of Africanus, it follows that these have been displaced by seven out of those XXXI dynasties of kings after Menes which now fill the three books of the Manetho of Africanus and Ptolemy. And our business, if we would recover the original Manetho, is to distinguish in the lists of Africanus *which* are the twenty-three genuine, and which are the seven interpolated dynasties, and to eject these latter, bringing down the seven mythological dynasties into their room. As a step towards this we shall first look for such internal indications as the lists of Africanus may afford of themselves; and then test them by the help of five sources older than the time of Ptolemy of Mendes, viz., the Chronicle, Eratosthenes, the Monuments, the Turin MS., and the citations in Josephus.

Now, at the first glance one gives to the thirty-one dynasties of Africanus, they divide themselves into two distinct and opposite classes, one class having every mark of historical reality, the other none whatever, or next to none; the one forbidding, the other provoking suspicion. In the first class the names of the kings are given with the years of each reign: in the second class the dynasties are either wholly anonymous, or all but anonymous, with the mention perhaps of a single name. Of the first class are Dynasties I, II, III, IV, V, VI, XII, XV, XVIII, XIX, XXI, and the rest to XXX inclusive, in all twenty, being three fewer than we are prepared to allow as genuine. Of the second or anonymous class are VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XIII, XIV, XVI, and XVII, in all ten,

being three more than we are seeking to eject as fictitious. But without looking far, there are some slight signs which may already hint which three of the ten are *less* open to suspicion than the rest. For Thebes being one of the great capitals, giving its name to a number of dynasties, it is perhaps unlikely that the *first* Theban dynasty named should be spurious; and Dyn. XI has one name distinctly connected with the kings of Dyn. XII; and if he were the first king who ever reigned at Thebes, he certainly would have been set at the head of a dynasty, even though a fictitious dynasty had been prefixed. Then again in Dyn. XIV (though it is slightly uncertain owing to a defect in the MSS. whether it may not belong to XIII), the sum of years given, 184, is the sum of one of the dynasties of the Chronicle, of one too which it purposely avoids describing in detail; so that this, though equally anonymous, may be either the same, or some other contemporary with it, under which the same space of time is alluded to. And, thirdly, although Dyn. XX is altogether anonymous, still, as it is within the period of the ascertained consecutive dynasties governing or claiming to govern all Egypt (from Dyn. XVIII downwards), it is less *probable* that any dynasty merely fictitious should be inserted here than at a more remote antiquity; and there are other grounds, as we shall see, which quite preclude the supposition.

I. Of the dynasties of the Chronicle, Dyn. XVI with its VIII kings headed (since it is the *first* of mortal kings) by Menes, clearly proves the historical character, if proof were needed, of Dyn. I. of Africanus, which has the same number of kings, and the same place at the head of the monarchy, though it adds 63 years to the 190 of the Chronicle, and varies the designation from "*Tanite*" to "*Thinite*" (the Egyptian name of This, *Teni*, facilitating the change). Dyn. II of the Chronicle, being "*Memphite*," justifies one at least, we may suppose the earliest, of the Memphite dynasties of Africanus. Dyn. XXVII of the Chronicle identifies itself with the last 184 years of the last four out of the six kings of Dyn. XV of Africanus. Dyn. XVIII and XIX of the Chronicle identify themselves with XVIII and XIX,

and XX of the Chronicle with XX and part of XXI of Africanus; and the remaining dynasties of the Chronicle XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVIII, XXIX, and XXX are identifiable upon the whole with Dynasties XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXIX, and XXX of Africanus, though the subdivision of the chronological space covered by these dynasties, and their designations and lengths, vary considerably in Africanus from those of the Chronicle. Dyn. XXVII of the Chronicle having been put back to its true place, and Dyn. XXVIII of Africanus, intended, no doubt, as a substitute for it, being neglected, as having nothing really answering to it in the Chronicle, the whole series of dynasties from XVIII to XXX inclusive is parallel, and the chronological space covered by them identical, as we shall find, in the two schemes, except that three years of the 1404 (for so many there are in the Chronicle) have in the list of Africanus been thrown back to the very commencement of the monarchy, and six other years of the same 1404 are in the list of Africanus represented by the six of its Dyn. XXVIII, which chronologically have no separate place of their own, but are contained in the years of the Persians. So then Dyn. XX of Africanus, although anonymous, is by comparison of the scheme of the Chronicle placed beyond all reach of suspicion.

II. In that portion of the list of Eratosthenes which has been copied by Syncellus from Apollodorus (a detailed analysis of it shall be given hereafter), there are joint allusions to the Chronicle, Manetho, and the monuments. Dyn. I of Africanus is identified with XVI of the Chronicle, and its due number of 190 years is *restored*, though the eight kings are for certain intelligible reasons compressed to five. Dyn. II of Africanus is also alluded to, its sum being indicated, and its last two reigns making together the first Memphite generation of Eratosthenes, the particulars of the gigantic stature of Sesochris fixing his identity. Dyn. III appears more fully; also IV and VI. To V there is no allusion, though its historical character is unquestionable; but Eratosthenes had only a certain limited number of generations and of years to fill, and could not even allude to all. Nothing

whatever appears to indicate that the anonymous dynasties VIII, IX, and X (to say nothing of VII) had ever existed; but before coming to names plainly belonging to Dyn. XII, he has no less than eight kings connected with Thebes by the surname "*Ammonodotus*" given to the first of them. So he justifies our anticipation that the *first* Theban Dynasty in Africanus, viz. Dyn. XI, although nearly anonymous, would scarcely turn out to be fictitious. After the names connected with Dyn. XII, there follow yet three names belonging neither to Dyn. XII, nor to XV, nor to XVIII of Africanus, before Syncellus breaks off, so that these three names should represent that third dynasty of Africanus (guessed from the sum 184 to be Dyn. XIV) which with XI and XX, though anonymous, is to be allowed as genuine. As regards the rest of the list of Eratosthenes, though the names are not given, we know the number of years and of generations still to follow, and comparing these with the names of Manetho, and the space of Manetho and the Chronicle still remaining unfilled, we may collect that he must certainly have filled up both Dyn. XX and all the other remaining dynasties of Africanus after XVII, omitting, beyond a doubt, the Shepherds of Dyn. XV, and *possibly* also Amyrtæus, if he perceived that his Dynasty XXVIII of six years was a mere representation, in a place where it could not stand, of years omitted at the head of Dynasty XXVI.

III. On the existing monuments and papyri there are (in the names of Menes and Athothis), traces though not contemporary, of Dyn. I of Africanus; probably also on some fragments of the Turin papyrus, if not elsewhere, there are names of Dyn. II. The names of the uppermost line to the left in the Karnak Chamber of Kings, seem to have been identified by Eratosthenes or his informants with Sesorcheres of Dyn. II and other kings of Dyn. III of Africanus. The names of Choufou or Shouphou (Χέουφ or Σούφης) and Mencheres, of Dyn. IV, have been identified beyond a doubt in the pyramids of Gizeh. Names of Dyn. V, called Elephantine (or Ἰξ'Ελεφαντίνης), are found mixed with those of Dyn. IV in the tombs of the pyramid-field near Memphis, showing pretty clearly that they were more closely connected with

Memphis or Heliopolis than with Elephantine, and at the same time attesting the historical character of the dynasty, though unnoticed by Eratosthenes. The names of the kings of Dyn. VI also occur, especially in central Egypt. Of the anonymous dynasties VII, VIII, IX, and X, there is no trace. But at Thebes, or in its neighbourhood, there are names and tombs of early kings exceeding in number those eight for which alone Eratosthenes could find room before the representatives of Dyn. XII, and justifying the *sixteen* Thebans of Dyn. XI in the lists of Africanus; so that Manetho must be supposed in this dynasty of *Upper Egypt* rather to have curtailed its years, than to have multiplied its kings; whereas in Dyn. I. of Africanus (XVI of the Chronicle,) we have found him doing the reverse. And Eratosthenes, who there reduces, here expands his years. Dyn. XII. appears fully on the monuments; and so does another dynasty or group of kings (among whom the names Seveklhotep and Neferhotep are frequent) plainly connected by lineage with the founders of Dyn. XII, and by locality with Nubia and Upper Egypt. This monumental group answers well enough to that anonymous but genuine dynasty of Africanus which we have guessed, from the sum 184, to be Dyn. XIV. On separate monuments eight or ten names only of these kings have as yet been found; but on the right side of the Thothmes Chamber of Karnak there are no less than xxx of them; and it is conceivable that xxvi was the number in the original Manetho, (the Karnak Chamber sometimes gives also princes,) and that the lx of his Dyn. XIII was meant by Ptolemy to include all the kings, in number about 60, who are represented on both sides of the same Karnak Chamber. Of the Shepherds of Dyn. XV, there is only one name, Apophis, certainly identified, on some fragments of the temple at Tanis; and the emblem of the god Sutech or Typhon accompanies this name. And this may probably be the second Apophis, who was last of the Shepherds, and whose short reign, omitted by Manetho, gave occasion to a transposition of an earlier Apophis, with 61 years, from the fourth to the sixth place: for we shall see hereafter that such a transposition has been made in the lists of Africanus. The kings of XVIII, XIX, and XX, (not

of XXI, though the *years* covered by it are placed beyond all doubt by the Chronicle,) and again of XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, and of XXVIII, (for Amyrtæus reigned over part of the Delta, though within the 124 years of the Persians,) and lastly of XXIX and XXX, are to be read on the monuments.

IV. The Turin Papyrus after Gods, as Ra and Horus, and Demigods, as Thoth and Ma, in vast periods, myriads of years, like those of the Chronicle and Manetho, offers names and sums of years connecting themselves with the general order of Manetho's dynasties as recoverable from the lists of Africanus. Menes, for instance, and Athothis stand first after the Gods and Demigods (the last of whom is a Horus), for the commencement of Dyn. I. Baichos, Kaiechos, Bi-netrou, Sethenes, Choires, and Nephhercheres, are perhaps identifiable for Dyn. II, Aches for Dyn. III, Soris and Mencheres for IV, Mencheres, Tatcherer, and Onnos for V. A reign of above 90 years, probably 94 (but certainly not 100 as Eratosthenes has made it, and as Syncellus casts it up in Dyn. VI of Africanus), followed by a reign of only one year and the name Nitocris, sufficiently identify Dyn. VI. A Mentuhotep may represent XI. The whole eight kings of Dyn. XII with the sum of the dynasty are distinguishable; and, lastly, there are found a prodigious number of kings with extremely short reigns, among whom the throne-name of Amenemhe I, and the names Sevekhoteb and Neferhotep are frequently repeated; and who are clearly connected by lineage with the first kings of Dyn. XII, and by locality, as has been said already, with Nubia and Upper Egypt, the names being the same, only with the addition of many more of kindred elements, as the thirty names of the right-hand side in the Thothmes Chamber of Karnak. So these names may be supposed to represent Dyn. XIV of Ksoites or Diospolites, according as the one name or the other was connected with the sum of 184 years by the original Manetho.

Besides names and figures and affinities, and a certain general order in the Turin papyrus, showing that hieratic papyri of the same kind were among the sources used by Manetho, there is in it a further peculiarity which may pos-

sibly throw light on one of the most obscure points in the earlier part of Manetho's scheme, viz. the nature and origin of his "Manes and other [mythical] Kings," registered by him before Menes. Of these there seem to be four dynasties in an order the inverse to that of the Chronicle, one with an indefinite number of kings (perhaps *Theban*) in 1817 years, another with *Memphite* kings in 1790 years, the third with ten *Thinite* kings in 350 years (being 35 years to each king of these ten), and after all these a fourth with a vast sum of 5813 years. But in the Turin MS., besides a number of ancient names of kings answering in their general character to those of Dyn. I and II, in which the syllable Ra does not as yet enter into composition, and names identifiable or spaces connected with names sufficient to correspond to those dynasties I, II, III, IV, V, VI, XI, XII of Africanus which are more or less identifiable, there are also intermixed and following a number of other names not to be found in the list of Africanus. And whatever be the principle on which the hieratic MS. was written, it is clear that its multitude of names even in the earlier dynasties, and still more after Dyn. XII, in what one may call the Nubian branch, was not fabricated to cover a fabulous number of generations of ordinary length, as Herodotus understood the 330 names of kings, read to him doubtless from a very similar papyrus, to be intended to cover a space of 11,000 years. On the contrary, a great number of the reigns, where the figures have been preserved, are extremely short, so that a number of them being put together give in one case an average of only seven years, in another of only two years and a half. It is open then to imagine that the principle on which the MS. was constructed was that rather of a genealogy of each family that had reigned, not only grown men who had actually reigned being given, but also those whose descendants more or less remote had reigned or might reign, and even infants, who while they lived had stood for a time in the line of succession. All such names crowned only after death in Amente, or on paper, might, when ejected from his own list by Manetho, be thrown up above Menes, and described as Manes, i. e. kings whose reigns were only

after death, nominal, in Amente, not in the upper world. And the large sum of 5813 years (to say nothing of the three sums preceding), need make no objection to this hypothesis, as the great sums in Manetho, and in the Chronicle, and in other sources, are, as now understood, divisible by twelve. So 5813 will be reducible to 484.5^m .; 1817 to 151.5^m .; 1790 to 149.2^m .; 350 to 29.2^m . And in full years the ten kings supposed to be ejected from the Thinite [or Tanite] lists would have not quite *three* years each: the thirty kings ejected from the *Memphite* lists would have not quite five years each; and thirty ejected from the Theban lists probably about the same. So there would be an excess of about 70 kings in the hieratic MS. as compared with the dynasties of Manetho hitherto accounted for: and the average quite agrees with what we see in the Turin MS. So to the end of Dyn. XII the MS. might have 143 names in something under six columns answering to the 73 names of Manetho. After that 484 years and 4 months at not quite the same average of five years would give 106 more kings, seemingly ejected from that part of the hieratic MS. which follows after Dyn. XII, and in which the Nubian lineage connected with Dyn. XII, (and so also with Dyn. XVIII and XIX below, and approaching nearest to the time when the papyrus was written,) is treated with such prodigious development. If we suppose 30 kings of this same lineage, who actually reigned, to be those on the right hand side in the Karnak Chamber, and 30 or 26 to be the true number of the Ksoite or Diospolite kings (perhaps a double or treble line) with 184 years in Manetho, we shall have $30 + 106$, i. e. 136 at most, (for there may have been fewer,) to add to the 143 obtained before, making 279 for the whole number of kings contained in the Turin papyrus in its XII or XIII columns, supposing, as seems probable, that it contained no names of Dyn. XVIII. The addition of 52 more would still be wanting to complete the 331 kings of Herodotus from Menes to Rameses II. or III. inclusive.

V. It is now time to transcribe and compare with that part of the lists of Africamus with which they correspond some long passages of narrative containing the lists of two

dynasties, and the first two names of a third, happily preserved to us by Josephus from Book II. of "Manetho himself."

"We once had a king named Timæus. In his time, I know not why, God was unpropitious, and some men of ignoble race from the parts to the East in a strange way had the confidence to invade our country, and *easily, without a battle*, subdued it. And having *subjected* to themselves them that had been its princes, they *afterwards* cruelly burned the cities and demolished the temples of the gods. And all the inhabitants of the country they used most barbarously, killing some and *reducing* others with their whole families to *slavery*. At length they made one of themselves king, whose name was Salatis. And he resided in Memphis, exacting tribute both from the *Upper* and the Lower country, and having garrisons in the fittest places. Especially he attended to the strengthening of the eastern frontier; foreseeing that the Assyrians, whose power was then getting very great, would desire to invade the same kingdom. And having observed in the Saitic (i. e. Setic or Sethroitic) Nome, a city very conveniently situated to the east of the Bubastic arm, which from some ancient theological reference was named Avaris [i. e. Ἀβαρόπολις, or Hebræopolis], he built it and made its walls exceedingly strong, and garrisoned it with a force of 240,000 men. Thither he was used to go in the summer season, both to collect his tributes in corn and to pay his troops, and also by constant exercises and reviews to strike terror into the peoples beyond the frontier.

"Salatis died after a reign of years . . .	19.
Another, Bnon [Βαιών, <i>Sync.</i>] succeeded	
him, and reigned	44.
Then another, Apachnas	36.7 ^m .
Then again Apophis	61.
And Janias	50.1 ^m .
And <i>lastly</i> Assis	49.2 ^m .

[Sum 259.10^m.]

"And these six were the first among them who became rulers, ever warring upon [πολεμούντες, persecuting] Egypt,

and seeking more and more to pluck out its root. The whole people of them collectively were called Hyk-shôs, i. e. Shepherd-kings; for *Hyk* in the hieratic dialect means a king, and *Shôs* both in the hieratic and in the vulgar idiom is a shepherd or shepherds, and so put together they form *Hyk-shôs*. Some say that they were Arabs" [Shôs or Shasou being the common designation of the Asiatic nomads, and first and chiefly of the Arabs, as Bedouin is often used now]. "These above-named kings of the people called Shepherds, and their posterity, held Egypt (Manetho says) 511 years.

"After these things *the kings*, he says, who were in *the Thebaid* and in the *rest of Egypt* rebelled against the Shepherds, and they had a great and long war, till in the time of a king named Alisphragmuthosis" [seemingly corrupted in the MSS. from Misphragmuthosis, as is written elsewhere by metathesis for Miphra-Thuthmosis, the fifth name in the list of Dyn. XVIII], "the Shepherds, he says, having been by him defeated, lost all the rest of Egypt, and were hemmed in within a place which was 10,000 *aroura* in circumference, named Avaris. All this space, Manetho says, the Shepherds surrounded with a vast and strong wall, that they might hold there in security all their possessions the spoils of Egypt.

"And Thummosis (Θουμβώσις, Θωώσις), the son of Alisphragmuthosis, endeavoured to reduce them by siege, blockading the place with 480,000 men; but at length, despairing of success by that way, he made a convention with them that they should depart unmolested whither they would; whereupon they, with all their families and possessions, being in number not fewer than 240,000, went out from Egypt into the desert towards Syria; but, fearing the power of the Assyrians, (for the Assyrians were then masters of Asia,) they built, in the country which is now called Judæa, a city large enough to contain all that multitude of their people, and named it Jerusalem."

"(In *another book* of the Αἰγυπτιακά Manetho says that 'This nation' of the people called Shepherds, 'are in our hieratic books called *bondsmen*.')

"After the people of the Shepherds had gone out from



Egypt to Jerusalem, Tethmosis, the king who had driven them out of Egypt, reigned after their expulsion

" [Tethmosis i. e. Amosis] years	25. 4 ^m .
And his son Chebron succeeding reigned	13.
After whom Amenophis	20. 7 ^m .
After him Amesses, [his] sister,	21. 9 ^m .
After her Miphres [i. e. Thothmes III. Mi- phra-Thuthmosis]	12. 9 ^m .
After him Miphramuthosis [i. e. the same as above, reduplicated, but really Amenoph II.]	25. 10 ^m .
After him Thmosis	9. 8 ^m .
After him Amenophis	30. 10 ^m .
After him Horus	36. 5 ^m .
After him Acenchres [his] daughter	12. 1 ^m .
After her Rathotis [her] brother.	9.
After him Acencheres	12. 5 ^m .
After him another Acencheres	12. 3 ^m .
After him Armais	4. 1 ^m .
After him Ramesses	1. 4 ^m .
After him Armesses Miammous	66. 2 ^m .
After him Amenophis	19. 6 ^m .

[Sum 333.]

" After him [reigned] Sethosis, who is also Ramesses, who was strong in cavalry, and had a fleet on the sea.

" This king made his brother Armais his deputy to govern Egypt, giving him all the prerogatives of royalty with only these restrictions, that he was not to wear the crown, nor ill-treat the queen, the mother of the young princes, nor touch any of the other royal concubines. And having thus provided, he himself invaded first Cyprus and Phœnicia, and afterwards Assyria and Media, and subdued them all, some by force of arms, and others without a blow, by the mere terror of his power. And being elated by his successes, he advanced still more confidently, subduing the cities and countries towards the East.

" And when now a long time had passed, Armais, who had been left in Egypt, began to do without scruple just

the contrary to all his brother's injunctions; for he took the queen by force to himself, and lived freely with the other concubines as his own, and wore at the suggestion of his friends the crown, and openly set up for himself against his brother.

"But the chief of the priests of Egypt wrote and sent a letter to Sethosis, informing him of all, and that his brother Armais had set up for himself; wherefore he immediately returned to Pelusium, and recovered his own kingdom. And the country was called from *his* name "Egypt;" for Manetho says that Sethosis was called Egyptus, and his brother Armais Danaus."—*Jos. Contr. Ap. lib. i. c. 14, 15.*

In this passage the Shepherd kings, conquered by Amosis the founder of Dyn. XVIII, are purposely made to cover and include the Hebrew bondsmen oppressed by Mephres-Tethmosis III. or Misphegmuthosis, and suffered to leave Egypt in the first year of his son and successor Amenoph II., 94 years after the overthrow and expulsion of the Shepherds. And the Shepherds thus confounded with the Hebrews are made to settle in Judæa and build Jerusalem, which was really taken and "built" by the Hebrews only in the time of king David.

In another passage extracted by Josephus, Manetho, ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφότητος μυθεομένων, gives avowedly an account of the Hebrews, whom he represents as a mixed people of lepers and other unclean outcasts, partly descended from the Shepherds, expelled long before, and partly of Egyptian origin. He confounds both them and the Shepherds with certain sun-worshipping Shasou, who ruled Egypt between the reigns of Amenoph III. and Horus; and represents their Exodus, under a leader who is Joseph and Moses blended into one person, as a victorious expulsion by Sethosis-Rameses the head of Dyn. XIX, son of Amenoph the last king of Dyn. XVIII, above 333 years of his own reckoning (really above 348) from the expulsion of the Shepherds, 254 from the true Exodus of the Hebrews, and 173.^{3m}. after the 13 years of the admitted subjection of Egypt to impious Asiatics, which intervene really between Amenoph III. and Horus. He even preserves Amenoph II. and III. as if sur-

viving under the same name in the later Amenoph, father of Sethosis, to enjoy the poetical retribution. Josephus, however, though he perceives that anyhow there will be inconsistency and absurdity, and complains that the Amenophis introduced is a fictitious king, whose epoch and reign Manetho dares not fix, thinks it least absurd to understand the Amenophis son of Rampses, and Rameses or Rampses (who however should be also Sethosis) son of Amenophis, who figure in the passage about to be given, to be the third and fourth kings of Dynasty XIX, for he introduces the extract as follows :

“ Manetho, relating that our ancestors [he means the Shepherds] came with many myriads into Egypt, and subdued it, and acknowledging that after that they” [but Manetho merges the Hebrews in the Shepherds, and the true Exodus in the expulsion of the Shepherds 94 years earlier, and by no means acknowledges the Hebrews at all in that former narrative] “ went out and occupied the present Judæa, and built Jerusalem and its Temple, thus far follows ancient histories;” [so Josephus was willing to have it believed ;] “ but *afterwards* giving himself license by saying that he will write the stories *commonly credited* about the Jews, he inserts worthless tales, seeking to confound with us a multitude of Egyptian lepers and other unclean outcasts. For adding also a king Amenophis, a false name, and on this account not daring to fix the time of his reign, (though he gives the years of the rest with precision enough,) he hangs upon him certain fables, forgetting how he had written that the *Shepherds* went out to Jerusalem about 518 years before. For Tethmosis [i. e. Amosis] was king when they went out. But from him the interval to the two brothers Sethos and Hermæus, surnamed Egyptus and Danaus, is 393 years” [i. e. reckoning at top the year of the expulsion of the Shepherds, and at bottom the 59 of Sethos, which are so inadvertently reduplicated]. “ And after expelling the latter,

“ Sethos reigned years 59

“ And the eldest of his sons, Rapsakes 66

[And 393 + 125 make 518.] “ Having then already confessed that our fathers went out so many years earlier, and then

having invented and put in an interpolated king whom he names Amenophis, he goes on and says :

“ This king desired to behold the Gods, like Horus, one of the kings who had reigned before him ;” [alluding probably to the same story as is given by Herodotus, only with the name of Hercules instead of Horus, Horus the God being the predecessor intended, rather than the king of Dyn. XVIII ;] “ and he communicated his desire to a priest named like himself Amenophis, son of Papis, who seemed to partake of the divine nature by his wisdom and prescience. And this his namesake told him that he might have his wish and see the Gods, if he would first cleanse the whole country from lepers and all other unclean persons then in it.

“ The king, well pleased, collected together from all Egypt all such as had any defect in their bodies, to the number of 80,000 ; and these he put into the quarries on the east side of the Nile, to work there and to be kept separate from the rest of the Egyptians. Now there were among them, he says, some learned men of the priests who were affected with leprosy. And that Amenophis, the sage and prophet, who has been mentioned already, began to fear lest the wrath of the gods should be provoked both against himself and the king, if it should appear that violence were done them ; and he added this prediction, that certain people should come *to the aid* of the unclean, and should be masters of Egypt for 13 years. Not daring, however, to say this to the king, he wrote all in a paper to leave behind him, and put an end to himself, at which the king was greatly distressed and dispirited.

“ And then he writes word for word thus : ‘ After a considerable time, those people becoming impatient of the hardships they endured in the quarries, the king was petitioned to set apart for their relief and shelter the city of Avaris which was *then* empty, *as* it had been evacuated by the Shepherds, and he granted it. Now that city, according to the theology, is from of old Typhonian ’ [i. e. under the influence of a malignant deity].

“ They having come thither, and having this place convenient for a revolt, set up as their leader a certain man

formerly of the priests of Heliopolis, named Osarsiph," [a name altered from Joseph,] "and bound themselves by oath to obey him in all things. He first made them a law that they should neither worship the gods, nor abstain from any of the sacred animals, not even from those most venerated in Egypt, but should sacrifice and eat all alike; and that they should intermarry with none but such as had sworn to their covenant. Having made such laws as these, and many others directly opposed to the customs of the Egyptians, he gave command that all their multitude should work at strengthening the walls of the city, and hold themselves in readiness for the war which he designed against Amenophis the king; while he, taking to him some more priests and others of those similarly unclean, sent an embassy, which he headed himself, to the Shepherds who had been driven out by Tethmosis, to the city called Jerusalem, and informing them of all that had befallen himself and the rest who had been ignominiously treated with him, he asked them to join him, and with one consent to attack Egypt. He promised first of all that he would reinstate them in Avaris, their ancestral country, and supply their host with all things needful in abundance, and fight for them," [*ὑπερμαχῆσθαι*, take their part and protect,] "as occasion might require, and assured them that he would without difficulty make the country subject to them. They joyfully agreed, and marching all of them at once, to the number of 200,000 men, within a short time arrived at Avaris.

"Amenophis, the king of Egypt, when he heard of their invasion, was in great consternation, remembering the prophecy of Amenophis, the son of Papis. And having first assembled the multitude of the Egyptians, and having consulted with their chiefs, he sent for the sacred animals, for those, that is, which have the highest honours in the temples, and gave orders to the priests in each locality to hide the images of the gods as carefully as possible. And *his son Sethos*, also called Ramesses, from Rampses, his [own] father, being then a boy of five years old, he put out to be taken care of *by his friend*. Then *crossing* and marching with the rest of the Egyptians, being 300,000 most valiant men, he

came up with the enemy, who advanced to meet him, but he did not join battle; for he scrupled lest he should be fighting against the Gods. So he turned, and came back to Memphis; and taking with him Apis and the other sacred animals which he had sent for, and which had been brought thither, he went straight up the country into Ethiopia with all his army and the multitude [i. e. all the principal people] of the Egyptians; for the king of the Ethiopians was under obligations to him, and was ready to serve him. [But in truth Ethiopia during all the time of this dynasty had no separate king.] Wherefore, receiving him and all the accompanying multitudes, he supplied their wants with all such provisions as the country afforded, and allotted them a sufficient number of cities and villages in which to pass the 13 years for which he was destined to be deprived of his throne; and further, he encamped an Ethiopian army of observation on the frontier, to assure the safety of King Amenophis.

“While these things were passing in Ethiopia, the Jerusalemites (Σολυμίται) having come down, and having joined the leprous Egyptians, they both together treated the inhabitants with such barbarity, that the [earlier] domination of the first-mentioned [the Shepherds] seemed to have been a golden time to such as saw the impieties and atrocities now committed. For they not only set fire to the cities and villages, nor were content with insulting or mutilating the images of the gods, but they even roasted and ate the sacred animals which were worshipped, and forced priests and prophets to sacrifice and slay these, or cast them out naked [from their offices and possessions]. And it is said that the priest who instituted their polity and laws, being by origin an Heliopolite, named Osarsiph” [i. e. Joseph, son-in-law of the chief priest of Heliopolis, made to derive his name from Osiris], “from Osiris the god worshipped in Heliopolis, when he went over to these people, changed his name, and was called Moses.”—*Jos. Contr. Ap.*, lib. i. c. 26.

“Manetho says again that ‘After this, Amenophis returned from Ethiopia with a great force, and his son Rampses too, heading another army of his own; and both together encountering the Shepherds (Shasoo) and the unclean, they

routed them, slew multitudes, and pursued the rest to the borders of Syria."—*Jos. Contr. Ap.*, lib. i. c. 27.

These extracts preserved by Josephus suffice to show how Manetho interposed in his narrative lists of kings supplied by the hieratic MSS.; and how their methodical exactness in enumerating for each reign its years, months, and even days (in which last point they were not followed by Manetho), contrasted with the mythical character of his own text. So that both opinions held concerning him are justified; on the one hand, that his work was of great historical value; on the other, that he was an impudent fabler, in whose stories different persons, names, times, and events are blended and confused together, so that they need to be analysed and separated into their original elements. And when this is done, even these stories are valuable, as being of pure Egyptian origin, quite unlike the later fables of writers who had become acquainted through the LXX. version with more or less of the contents of the books of Moses. And, though fables, they are each in their details a tissue of allusions to real history. Into a closer examination this is not the place to enter: but we see now what is meant when it is said that the Chronographer *collected* out of Manetho a certain sum of years; since he had need to pick out the historical lists derived from the hieratic papyri from the fabling narrative in which they were interposed.

In the passages given by Josephus there are the full lists of two dynasties, viz. XV and XVIII, of Africanus, and the first two names of XIX. But if these are taken together with the narrative, and if all the statements of the narrative are supposed to be consistent, and of equal authority, there ought to be a succession of other Shepherd kings during exactly 251 years and two months ($511 - 259.10^m. = 251.2^m.$) between the death of Assis the last of the six Shepherds of Dyn. XV of Africanus, and the accession of Alisphragmuthosis, Misphragmuthosis, Tethmosis, or whatever name be given him, who founded Dyn. XVIII, and reigned 25 years and 4 months "after expelling the Shepherds." But from the sum which, as we shall see below, he "collected," it is clear that the Chronographer, that is

Eratosthenes, gave no place to any such anonymous "descendants" of the six Shepherds above-named, nor to any interval of 251 years between them and Dyn. XVIII. And, what is more, even the re-editor and amplifier of Manetho, Ptolemy of Mendes, or whoever else he was, though he had here an opportunity of building one, or if he pleased two fresh dynasties, with 251 years, out of a distinct assertion of Manetho, gives instead two dynasties of "*other* Shepherds," (we need not dwell upon the designation *Ἕλληνες*,) not even adding from Manetho "descendants of the preceding," the one dynasty with 518, the other with 151 years. So he agrees with Eratosthenes in entirely neglecting the express assertion of Manetho's text, that the whole domination of the six Shepherds *and their descendants* from first to last covered a space of 511 years. In the same way there are 13 years mentioned, during which Amenoph, the father of Sethos, was driven from his throne; and some years of Armaus-Danaus, during the absence of his brother Sethos, whose 59 years are said to be all "after the recovery of his kingdom, and the expulsion of his brother Danaus." The Chonographer then had to divine what was the truth; and he decided that, whatever facts might be alluded to under the stories connected with these years, the 19 years of Amenoph (at the end of Dyn. XVIII of Africanus) and the 59 of Sethos (at the commencement of XIX) were alone to be admitted and reckoned. So neglecting with him, and even with the author of the lists of Africanus, the incidental statements of the text of the original Manetho, and extracting only those lists of kings which are given with the years and months of each reign, we obtain through Josephus a distinct confirmation of our inference already made on other grounds, that the Diospolitan Dynasty XVIII, which expelled the Shepherds, followed immediately after that which stands as XV in the lists of Africanus. This latter then was really Dyn. XVII in the series of the original Manetho (for there is no doubt that he numbered and distinguished the XXX Dynasties, though he by no means exhibited them in a tabular form, which would have been only parading the inconsistency of his general narrative). And that

such was also the true historical succession is confirmed from other sources, of which one, and a remarkable one, is this:— Syncellus mentions that it is a point “agreed upon by all, that Joseph came into Egypt under Apophis,” the fourth, according to the original Manetho of Josephus, of the six Shepherd kings. But this fact, agreed upon by all, and yet reconcilable with the chronology of none (for it agrees neither with that of Africanus, nor with that of Eusebius, nor, taking the list as it stands in Josephus, even with that of Syncellus himself), must be supposed to rest upon some other anterior foundation. And if we reckon back from the commencement of Dyn. XVIII in B.C. 1748, 94 years before the Exodus, according to our joint scale of sacred and profane chronology collected from the Egyptian Chronicle and Josephus, we find the 130th year before the accession of Amosis, that is, the year of Joseph’s advancement coinciding nearly with B.C. 1878, to be according to Manetho’s list of the six Shepherds in Josephus the 31st year of Apophis; and so, Joseph having been born, as it appears, in the first year of the reign of Apophis, his coming into Egypt in his own 17th year falls also naturally in the 17th year of the reign of the same king, B.C. 1892.

Hitherto we have been going on the assumption that the original Manetho made in his three books xxx dynasties in all, and that within these, and naturally in Book I., the seven mythological groups given by Eusebius from Africanus were included. And to make room for the restoration of these seven groups as dynasties to their proper places, we have been bringing together indications from six distinct sources, which have concurred to justify the ejection of the anonymous Dynasties VII, VIII, IX, X, XIII, XVI, and XVII of the lists of Africanus.

We shall now begin afresh; and forgetting for the moment what first suggested or has since justified the ejection of these seven anonymous dynasties, we shall *assume*, as if *arbitrarily*, that those twenty-three dynasties of Africanus which are numbered I, II, III, IV, V, VI, XI, XII, XIV, XV, XVIII, and so on to XXX inclusive, were alone originally the dynasties of ordinary kings from Menes, and

that they were numbered by Manetho himself as Dynasties VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, respectively, and so on, the dynasties from XVIII to XXX inclusive being identical as regards their numbering in the two schemes. To this assumption, presented as a mere arbitrary hypothesis, we shall apply a test which is furnished by Syncellus, but which he derived probably through Apollodorus from Eratosthenes.

"Manetho," says Syncellus, "the most celebrated historian of the Egyptians, writing of the same XXX Dynasties," (the same, that is, with those of the Chronicle described and copied out from Africanus just before,) "or at least taking them for his base, differs much from them in his spaces of time, as may be seen both from what has been said above, and from what shall be said further. For from the contents of his three books, that is to say, from the CXIII generations in XXX dynasties, *the Chronographer*," [ὁ χρόνος being a corruption from ὁ χρονογράφος written contractedly], "collected a sum total of 3555 years, ending about 15 years before the *cosmocracy* of Alexander." "Ὁ δὲ Μανέθω περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν λ' δυναστειῶν γράψας, ἐκ τούτων δηλαδὴ λαβὼν τὰς ἀφορμὰς, κατὰ πολὺ διαφωνεῖ περὶ τοὺς χρόνους πρὸς ταῦτα [ταύτας?] . . . Τῶν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς γ' τόμοις ρηγ' γενεῶν ἐν δυναστείαις λ' ἀναγεγραμμένων αὐτῶν [αὐτῶ, corrigit Buns.], ὁ χρονογράφος τὰ πάντα συνῆξεν ἔτη γφνέ' . . . λήξαντα πρὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνης κοσμοκρατορίας ἔτη που ιε'."—(*Sync. Chronograph.*, p. 52.)

It is clear that, in this passage, the sum of years spoken of by Syncellus is that of the kings, and that consequently they were collected *not* from *all* "the XXX dynasties" of the original Manetho, but from those only of the XXX which contained the years of kings from Menes, Syncellus here identifying the original with the Manetho of Africanus, in which the years of the kings form the whole contents both of the three books and of the thirty dynasties. The CXIII generations of the Chronicle being certainly not reproduced in any sense in the Manetho of Africanus, while they are distinctly exhibited, though in a varied form, by the latest pseudo-Manetho of Anianus and Pano-

dorus, often followed by Syncellus, it would be natural to suppose that the ascription of the CXIII generations to the original Manetho was also a confused addition of Syncellus's own. But there is reason to think that Manetho really reckoned CXIII average generations of time (not CXIII names or reigns of kings). For 3555 divided by 113 gives an average of 31 years and about 5 months, which *of itself* agreeing neither with the general average of the Chronicle for its reigns or royal generations, which is $24\frac{1}{2}$, nor with the average of Herodotus for lives, which is $33\frac{1}{3}$, would rather discourage the thought that Manetho reckoned in any such peculiar generations of his own. But when we look into the sums of his dynasties of kings, we find that, in the first six, that is, in *all* the ancient dynasties of *Lower* Egypt, their forty-eight kings in 1491 years have, one with another, *reigns* not merely of $24\frac{1}{2}$ years each, the full average of the Chronicle, but of something over 31 years, being very nearly that peculiar average of $31\frac{1}{2}$ which is obtained on division of 3555 by 113; (and Dyn. I. of Africanus actually has for its reigns the full average of $31\frac{1}{2}$;) while the 113 kings of all the other following dynasties exclusively of Dyn. XIV of Afric., have, if taken together, in 1880 years, an average of only $16\frac{1}{2}$ years to each. So we may suppose that his idea was to give CXIII average *generations*, in the sense of *lives*, not *reigns*, to the monarchy; but that, for some reason connected with the symmetry of his scheme, he made his generations somewhat shorter than they would have been, had he followed the usual calculation of three to a century, and somewhat longer than the analogous "xv generations of the Cycle" occurring in the Old Chronicle.

"The Chronographer" is no doubt Eratosthenes, though it was through Apollodorus, probably, as has been said above, that Syncellus derived his information. It is plain that Eratosthenes, in setting about the task imposed on him by the king, would have, as a first step, to consider and compare the sums and averages given to the kings after Menes by the Chronicle and by Manetho respectively. The sum of the former being 1881 years, ending 15 years before the cosmo-

crazy of Alexander, the sum of the latter, as he collected it, turned out to be 3555, ending, as Syncellus understood, at the same point. Eratosthenes found in the Chronicle in all xxx dynasties and cxiii generations; but the 1881 years of kings occupied only xv of these xxx dynasties, and only lxxvi of the cxiii generations; and these lxxvi generations alone were average *reigns* of $24\frac{1}{2}$ years, the xv dynasties of kings having each separately its own peculiar average artificially determined, but from the facts of its actual history. In Manetho's three books he found again the xxx dynasties, containing, like those of the Chronicle, not only kings after Menes, but Gods and Demigods besides. But here the kings after Menes occupied not xv only, but xxiii of the dynasties; and not lxxvi only out of cxiii, but a complete series of cxiii average life-generations of their own, besides others uncounted, which might belong to the Gods, the Demigods, and the Manes. And the dynasties of Manetho being filled with actual reigns, it was only in the first six that these actual reigns seemed to be identified, *on the whole*, with as many of his cxiii abstract *life generations*, though each dynasty by itself, like those of the Chronicle, has its own peculiarities.

Now, let us take the sum of 3555 collected by Eratosthenes from the original Manetho, and apply it as a separate test to the xxx dynasties of the kings in the lists of Africanus, as they stand, only cutting off Dyn. XXXI, as being manifestly of subsequent addition. According to the sums given by Africanus for the contents of the three books of his Manetho, viz. 2300 (or 2303) + 2121 + 1050, making in all 5471 or 5474 years of kings after Menes, there are 1916 over the sum of 3555. And even after deducting from this excess 1862 years, the sum of the seven dynasties we have ejected, there still remains an excess of 54 years, interpolated, as it would seem, in the re-edition of Ptolemy and Africanus, into the genuine dynasties of the original Manetho, supposing the sums given by Africanus for the three books to be correct, or all but correct.

But if we take the actual sums of the xxiii genuine dynasties as cast up by Syncellus (and these as varieties, even

if inconsistent with the sums given for the Books, must be from some source), substituting only for his sums in Dyn. XV and XVIII of Africanus the sums of "Manetho himself" preserved by Josephus, and making one other correction from the text of Africanus, and from the Turin Papyrus, in the sum of Dyn. VI, we obtain the following as an approximate and conjectural restoration of the scheme of the original Manetho:—

BOOK I.

Dyn. I. Of VII Gods from Phtha to Horus, Horus being last:	}	13,900
Dyn. II. Of other Gods to Bitys, making [with the preceding] years		
Dyn. III. Of Demigods, years 1255 [for which, to suit the sums given below, we may substitute 1230]		
Dyn. IV. Of other Kings [Manes, viz. xxx Thebans ejected from the hieratic lists?] years		1817
Dyn. V. Of [Manes] xxx Memphites [ejected like the preceding,] years		1790
Dyn. VI. Of [Manes] x Tanites [ejected like the preceding] years		350
Dyn. VII. Of Manes [cvi Nubians or Ethio- pians similarly ejected ?] years		5813
Sum of years of the Demigods and Manes		11,000
The sum total [of the VII mythological Dynasties, amounts to years]		24,900
Dyn. VIII. [XVI of the Chron. with 190 years, I of Afric.] of VIII Thinite <i>kings</i> , years . . .		253
Dyn. IX. [II of Afric.] of IX Thinites . . .		302
Dyn. X. [XVII of the Chron. during 39 of its 103 years, III of Afric.] IX Memphites		214
Dyn. XI. [IV of Afric.] of VIII Memphites . . .		277
Dyn. XII. [V of Afric.] of IX Elephantinites . .		248
Dyn. XIII. [XVII of the Chron. during 22 years, VI of Afric.] of vi Memphites		197

Dyn. XIV. [XI of Afric.] of xvi Diospolites, with
43, and after them Amenemhe I. with 16 years . 59

Sum of the kings in Book I., LXVI, and of years 1550

Which sum of 1550 years divided among LXVI kings will
give to each reign an *apparent* average length of something
under 20 years and 6 months.

BOOK II.

Dyn. XV. [XVII of the Chron. during 42 years,
XII of Afric.] of vii Diospolite Kings, years . 160

Dyn. XVI. [XIV of Afric.] of LXXVI [?] *Ksoites* 184

Dyn. XVII. [XXVII of the Chron. with 184 years,
XV of Afric. with 284 years] of vi Shepherds . 259.10^m.

Dyn. XVIII. [XVIII of the Chron. with 348
years, XVIII of Afric.] of xvi Diospolites . 333

Sum of the years in Book II. . . . 936.10^m.

and of the kings (XXIX + LXXVI =), CV.

(Or if the first fifteen years of Dynasty XIX are to be
included, the sum in that case instead of 936 years and 10
months will be 951 years and 10 months.) The *apparent*
average length of the reigns with LXXVI kings to Dynasty
XVI is something under 9 years; but the average for the
XXXI kings of the other three dynasties, without Dynasty
XVI, is 24 years and a half.

BOOK III.

Dyn. XIX. [XIX of the Chron. with 194 years]
of vii Diospolites, years 15 + 194 = . . . 209

Dyn. XX. [XX of the Chron. during 135 years of
its 228 years] of xii Diospolites . . . 135

Dyn. XXI. [XX of the Chron. during the last 93
of its 228 years] of vii Tanites, years [93 + 37
thrown up from below =] . . . 130

Dyn. XXII. [XXI of the Chron. with 121 years]
of ix Bubastites . . . 120

Dyn. XXIII. [XXII and XXIII of the Chron. and
XXIV during 21 of its 44 years] of iv Tanites 89

Dyn. XXIV. [XXIV of the Chron. during 6 of its 44 years] of one Saite	6
Dyn. XXV. [XXV of the Chron. during 40 of its 44 years] of III Ethiopians	40
Dyn. XXVI. [XXVI of the Chron. from the middle of its 27th year to its end] of IX Saïtes	150.6 ^m .
Dyn. XXVII. [XXVIII of the Chron.] of VIII Persians, years 124, with 4 months cast down from above =	124.4 ^m .
Dyn. XXVIII. [not in the Chron.] of one Saïte, years [all unchronological, or cast down from above]	6
Dyn. XXIX. [its last 19 years = the first 19 of XXIX of the Chron.] of III Mendesians [Tanites?] years [1 + 4 months, unchronological, cast down from above + 19 historical =]	20.4 ^m .
Dyn. XXX. [XXIX of the Chron. during its last 20 years, and XXX] of III Sebennytes?	38

Sum of kings in Book III. LXVII, and of years 1068.2^m.

(Or, if the first fifteen years of Dynasty XIX are to be included in Book II, the sum of the years of Book III. will be 1053 years and 2 months). The *apparent* average length of the reigns is not quite 15 years.

The apparent sum of all the actual kings from Menes in the three books is (LXVI + CV + LXVII =) CCXXXVIII, and that of the years is (1550 + 936.10^m. + 1068.2^m. =) 3555; giving CXIII life-generations at something less than 31 years and a half to a generation, but to CCXXXVIII reigns, if all be thrown together, giving an *apparent* average of scarcely 15 years. But we may subtract Dyn. XVI [XIV of Afric.] with its LXXVI kings and 184 years, (which will be safer than counting it with a conjectural reading of only XXX, XXXVI or XXVI kings to answer to the right hand side of the Karnak Chamber, these being supposed to represent two or three concurrent lines thrown together;) and again we may subtract three kings at least either from Dyn. XXI or from Dyn. XXVI, as reduplications; and after these reductions the remaining CLVIII kings will have in the remaining 3171

years an apparent average of something over 20 years each. Probably then the kings for the 184 years of the excluded Dyn. XVI were not really more than IX in any one single line; and, even if three lines were compressed into one, they would not be much above XXVI, which may be reconcileable with the appearance of XXX cartouches on the right hand side of the Karnak Chamber.

The 3555 years of the kings, reckoned from Menes in XXIII dynasties by Manetho, end at the same point of time with the 1881 years of the kings reckoned from Menes in xv dynasties by the Chronicle, viz. at Nov. 18, B.C. 345, 14 years before Manetho's date for Alexander, that is, before the foundation of Alexandria, in B.C. 331, (for he throws up and so marks 14 years,) or 15 years before the *cosmocracy* of Alexander in B.C. 330, which is the reckoning of the Chronicle. But if we include also his seven mythological dynasties, the sum total of Manetho's scheme will amount to 28,455 years.

The scheme thus obtained is certainly in its details only conjectural and approximative; for it is not probable that the sum of years left by Ptolemy of Mendes, or cast up by Syncellus, was exactly that of the original Manetho (fractions only being equalised) in every dynasty except those two in which Josephus has helped us both to eject years added by Ptolemy, and to restore years and kings dropped out in the list of Africanus. And in Dyn. VI of Africanus (XIII of the original Manetho), though the text of Africanus expressly excludes the first 6 years of the 100 of Phiops from his reign, and the Turin Papyrus gives him not 100 but 90 and some units, which are lost, it is open to any one to argue that Eratosthenes, who gives him 100 to his "*generation*," was herein following Manetho, and not considering only the exigencies of his own scheme of generations. No alteration, some may say, should have been introduced, except perhaps from Josephus, into the sums of Syncellus, which are either all to be followed consistently, or all debated, each on its own grounds, separately. But even though we leave to Dyn. VI of Africanus the 203 years given it by Syncellus, the sum of 3555 years found by Erato-

sthenes may still be said to be exactly exhibited, if only we suppose Eratosthenes to have understood that the 6 years of Dyn. XXVIII, that is, of Amyrtæus, are really only concurrent years included under the 124 of the Persians, and consequently to have omitted them from his reckoning. But there is another quarter in which errors of detail, however compensated, may be presumed to exist; when we consider that while the sums of the other dynasties have been taken from the lists of Africanus, with the fractions of the original Manetho rounded off to full years, the sums of four dynasties XV, XXVI, XXVII, and XXIX of Africanus are exhibited with fractions of 10, 6, 4, and 4 months respectively. Of these fractions the last three only are given anomalously, from whatever motive or accident, in the lists of Africanus; the first has been introduced incidentally by ourselves from the text of the original Manetho supplied by Josephus. And it can only be by accident that this fraction of ten months brought in by ourselves unites exactly into a whole year with the other fraction of two months which would otherwise have remained on adding up the sums of the three later dynasties. But in truth, in such an attempt at reconstruction as the present, and with such imperfect means at our disposal, *perfect* success, and the exact exhibition of arithmetical coincidences in detail, are grounds rather for suspicion against the process than for confidence in the result.

The general outline of Manetho's scheme having now been ascertained, it may be compared with those earlier cyclical schemes of B.C. 1322 and B.C. 305, the later of which, that of the Chronicle, he is said, with some variations, to have followed.

If one thought only of the times of the monarchy, which come last in the whole series, and compared the scheme of Manetho with that of the Chronicle, going back from the last year of Nectanebo II, it might seem at first sight as if Manetho's process had been to cover with additional kings, thrusting back Menes, first the "443 years of the Cycle" thrown back by the Chronicle, then its 217 of Demigods, then a round thousand of its 3984 years of the XIII Gods, and lastly 14 years besides, so as to have in all ($1660 + 14 =$)

1674 additional years of kings. And of these the last-mentioned number 14 might perhaps suggest a suspicion that either Apollodorus or Syncellus had misunderstood the reckoning and allusion of Eratosthenes; and that the 3555 years collected by the latter really covered the interval of 14 years between Nectanebo and the foundation of Alexandria in B.C. 331, which Manetho may have preferred to make his closing point rather than the "*cosmocracy*" of Alexander a year later. But this on examination will not turn out to be the case.

The mythological dynasties at the head of Manetho's scheme show that his first and greatest variation from the Chronicle was this; that whereas the Chronicle had picked out from the month-years of the older scheme of B. C. 1322 the precise number 2922, out of which they had all sprung, and had given these only (with certain heterogeneous fractional numbers of 681, 341, and 40 added) to its XIII Gods, suppressing one pseudo-cycle of 1461 month-years, and giving the remaining 22 pseudo-cycles of month-years (all except the 681 nominally detached) to the Sun; Manetho, on the contrary, wished to return towards the older method, and to re-distribute among Gods, Demigods, and Manes (the last, perhaps, an addition of his own) the myriads of month-years alienated from them by the Chronicle, so as to impose upon the imagination of his Greek readers. But the ejection in the Chronicle of one twenty-fourth part, one cycle we may call it, out of the original XXIV pseudo-cycles of month-years, in order to make room for the new cycle of real years growing since B. C. 1322, having destroyed the symmetry of the remaining sum of month-years, and their aptitude for division by 12, Manetho could not conveniently take them from the Chronicle as they stood, and redistribute its 33,603 month-years ($30,000 + 681 + 2922$) among his Gods, Demigods, and Manes. Had he done this, the true space of 2922 real years, underlying all the month-years, would neither have been recoverable on division by 12, as from the 34,064 month-years of the older scheme of B. C. 1322, nor would it have been indicated separately, as in the Chronicle. It was necessary, therefore, to make some

change; and the change that he made was this:—Distinguishing in that original sum of 2922 real years, out of which all month-years, of whatever scheme, had grown, three sums of 2000, 900, and 22 respectively, he discarded not only the fancy of exhibiting an *ἀποκατάστασις*, but all idea of cyclical symmetry, and multiplied by 12 the two thousands only, so obtaining a sum of 24,000 month-years, resolvable at will, with all their subdivisions, into true years, and giving these with the 900 *unmultiplied* prefixed, in all 24 900 mixed or nominal years, to his Gods, Demigods, and Manes. Probably the 900 full years, equivalent to 10,800 of the month-years of the older schemes, made the reign of Phtha, if Phtha had a reign *in time*, and Manetho, like the informants of Diodorus, made him the offspring of Μῶρ or Νεῖλος. But the 22 real years still remaining, as *he* had no intention of giving precisely two cyclical spaces (i. e. 2922 real years) to the Gods, or to the old world, he made to be the first 22 years of Menes, at the head of the ordinary monarchy.

At the point, then, at which he ends his mythological dynasties, Manetho is short by 22 of the end of the first 2922 real years of human time, whether multiplied by 12, as in the older scheme of B. C. 1322, or by $11\frac{1}{2}$, as they are in the Chronicle; and he had before him, in the Chronicle, to convert into years of kings, if he pleased, after these 22 years, its 341 fictitious solar years added for a cyclical purpose, its 40 thrown up from between B. C. 345 and 305, its 217 of Demigods, and lastly its 443 thrown up from between B. C. 305 and A. D. 139, the true end of the Cycle which commenced in B. C. 1322. So he might have made out of these in all 1041, or, with the 22, 1063 fresh years of kings, in themselves partly real and partly fictitious (but as years of kings all chronologically fictitious, since Menes was thrust up to their head), before coming to the 1881 true and chronological years of the monarchy, as given by the Chronicle.

This, it seems, was not room enough for the materials he meant to use. So discarding those 341 fictitious years which in the earlier schemes had been inserted for a cyclical reason, but in his own uncyclical scheme had no propriety,

he borrowed from the Chronicle its device of throwing up years "of the Cycle," that is, of the real current cycle, and used it not now for any cyclical purpose, but in order to obtain a sufficient framework of fictitious time, labelled as such for those that could understand, in which to place as consecutive dynasties of kings really contemporaneous and included historically within the 1881 years following. For this purpose, besides 22 years of the Gods, and the 217 of the Demigods, and the 443 of the last part "of the Cycle" *named* and thrown up by the Chronicle, he covered with kings a reduplication of those 978 years of the same Cycle which had passed between its commencement in B. C. 1322 and Nectanebo II. ; so that, had he only retained those other 40 years of the Cycle from between B. C. 345 and B. C. 305 which the Chronicle had cast up *unnamed*, and had added to its Gods, he would have had exactly one cycle of fictitious years thrown up or reduplicated from between B. C. 1322 and A. D. 139, besides those 22 and 217 real years which he also added to the times of the monarchy. And then, reckoning downwards from the beginning, he would have had three cyclical spaces, two of real and the third of fictitious time, before coming to the true unycyclical continuation of 1120 years ending at the epoch of the real Cycle in B. C. 1322, with 978 thence to Nectanebo II., and 14 more on to Alexander and the foundation of Alexandria. But this he avoided, no doubt purposely ; and, instead of retaining the whole 40 years of the interval between Nectanebo and the Lagidæ as thrown up by the Chronicle, he retained and added to the times of the early kings only 14 of these 40 years. Thus he at once avoided falling partially into a cyclical form, and marked the foundation of Alexandria, in the autumn of B. C. 331, as his own epoch for the close of native Egyptian history and the commencement of the times of the Macedonians.

The three schemes, of B. C. 1322, of the Chronicle of B. C. 305, and of the original Manetho, may now be compared with one another as follows:—

In the scheme of B. C. 1322, A, the first 2922 years of real time, as reckoned by the Egyptians, $\times 12$, become 35,064 nominal years, really months, divisible into 23,220

+ (681 + 2922 + 341) + (1120 + 6780); or into 32,142 + 2922; or into 10,800 + 24,000 + 264.

In the scheme of the Chronicle, B, the same first 2922 real, or 35,064 month-years, by the suppression of one pseudo-cycle of 1461 of their number, become 33,603, this being the same thing as if 2922 had been multiplied by $11\frac{1}{2}$ instead of 12. And 33,603 nominal years of the Chronicle are divisible into 30,681 + 2922; or into 9900 + 23,000 + 253.

In the scheme of Manetho, C, the same first 2922 real years are exhibited by 900 full years (which would equal, if multiplied by 12, 10,800 of the month-years of A) + 24,000 month-years + 22 full years (which, if multiplied by 12, would equal 264 of the month-years of A).

Then, as regards the 1120 more years of real time following upon the first 2922, and reaching to the cyclical epoch, July 20, B. C. 1322, the scheme connected with that epoch, A, prefixes to these 1120 real years 341 other fictitious years, in order to fill them up to 1461, and make time seem to have run from the first in Sothic cycles. The complete cycle of 1461 years thus obtained (being the third, or the twenty-fifth, according as the first 2922 real years are reckoned simply, or are multiplied by 12), is divisible into [341] + 217 + 903.

The scheme of the Chronicle, B, has the same addition of the 341 fictitious years; and its third space of 1461 full years thus obtained, is consequently in truth, and for the initiated, composed of the same elements as in the older scheme A, and is divided or divisible (for the 341 do not stand out of themselves) into [341] + 217 + 903. But *in appearance* its third cycle of full (or twenty-fourth of mixed) years is constituted very differently, viz. of [341] + [40] + 217 + [443] + 420, this last number being the first 420 only of the 903 years. The true cyclical epoch of B. C. 1322 is put back by 483 years to an imaginary point answering to B. C. 1805, in order that a *fourth* cycle of *full*, or twenty-fifth of mixed years, may seem to end in B. C. 345, 483 years before the true cyclical epoch of A. D. 139.

The scheme of Manetho, C, not being cyclical, omits the 341 fictitious years inserted as a cyclical complement in the

two older schemes; or rather it substitutes for them a greater number of fictitious years of its own, viz. 978, these being the first 978 years "of the Cycle," the years, that is, which had passed from B. C. 1322 to Nectanebo II., reduplicated and thrown back, in like manner as the remaining 40 past and 443 future years of "the Cycle," i. e. of the cycle current in Manetho's time, had been thrown back by the Chronicle. And of these latter Manetho retained the 443 as thrown up; but of the 40 years' interval between Nectanebo II. and the Lagidæ, as thrown up in the Chronicle, he retained only 14 years, partly, as has been explained above, in order to mark his own closing point to be the foundation of Alexandria, and partly to avoid making one precise cycle of anticipated years.

Setting aside all amplification by the help of month-years, the four schemes of A, B, C, and that preserved by Diogenes Laertius, which may be called D, will stand parallel to one another thus:

A.	$(1935 + 328.8m + 656.4m) + [341]$	— — + 217 + 903	to B. C. 1322.
B.	2922	+ [341] + [40] + 217 + [443] + <u>420 + 483</u> + 978	to B. C. 345.
C.	<u>900 + 2000 + 22</u>	+ [978 + 14 + 443] + 217 + 903	+ 978 to B. C. 345.
D.	2922	— — — + 217 + 903	+ 978 + 13 to B. C. 332.

To kings from Menes the older scheme, A, probably gave only 903 years, from B. C. 2224 to B. C. 1322; the Chronicle, B, and the authors of the computation in Diogenes Laertius, D, continued with 978 years more to B. C. 345, so making in all 1881, with 15 or 13 on to Alexander the Great in B. C. 330 or B. C. 332. Manetho alone made to Nectanebo II. 3555 years of kings from Menes, who so seemed to be put back by him ($443 + 217 + 14 + 978 + 22 =$) 1674 years from the anticipated Julian year B. C. 2224 to B. C. 3897. But of these 3555 years all but the last 1881 are either years anterior to Menes, belonging originally to Gods and Demigods; or else they are years unhistorical and fictitious, years posterior to Nectanebo, or even years of Ptolemies and Cæsars yet future, anticipated and thrown back by the Chronicle to times before Menes, but made by Manetho to follow him; or lastly, they are years absent from all the earlier schemes,

reduplicated and thrown back, i.e. fabricated, after the example of the Chronicle, by Manetho himself.

Placed after an imposing series of mythological dynasties, the *kings* of Manetho were plainly meant to be all taken for consecutive; and it might have been enough for his purpose merely to enumerate the groups of their dynasties in the order in which the cities of Tanis, Memphis, and Thebes rose successively to importance, without alluding to the fact that some dynasties were contemporary. Not content with this, he has added here and there short notices implying that each king and dynasty reigned successively over all Egypt. But for us who have found in the origin of his other spaces of time a confession that all the dynasties of kings are contained chronologically within the space of 1881 years, the only problem is to discover the true historical place and duration of each.

That there were in early times a number of kings reigning at once in different parts of Egypt is not only most probable from the analogy of neighbouring nations, but it is alluded to by Herodotus as a fact; perhaps also in the book of Psalms; (cv. “*ἄρχοντας αὐτοῦ*,” his princes, and “*πρεσβυτέρους*” or *σατράπας*.) and it is distinctly asserted from Egyptian sources by others, as by Artapanus, who with reference to the end of Dyn. XV of Africanus (XVII of Manetho) and the commencement of XVIII says that in those times there were many kings reigning in Egypt, “*πολλοὺς γὰρ τότε τῆς Αἰγύπτου βασιλεύειν*.” And hence Africanus makes no difficulty even to admit that all the XXXI Dynasties of Ptolemy of Mendes might have reigned since the Flood and the Dispersion: “*Quod si temporum copia adhuc exuberet,*” *reputandum sedulo est plures fortasse Ægyptiorum reges unâ eâdemque ætate extitisse: namque et Thinitas regnavisse aiunt et Memphitas, et Saitas et Æthiopas, eodemque tempore alios. Videntur præterea alii quoque alibi imperium tenuisse, atque hæc dynastiæ suo quoque in Nomo semet continuisse; ita ut haud singuli reges successivam potestatem acceperint, sed alius alio loco eâdem ætate regnaverit. Atque hinc contigit ut tantus cumulus annorum confieret.*” (*Euseb. Chron. i. c. 19, e Versione Lat. ex Arm. Ed. Mai.*)

But what is *most* of all to the purpose is this, that Manetho himself in his narrative not only, at the commencement of the dynasty of the Shepherds, speaks of them as subjecting the native princes of Egypt, in the plural, (τοῖς ἡγεμονεύσαν-
τας ἐν αὐτῇ χειρωσάμενοι,) but also at its end shows that the same native rulers had continued all along, though as vassals or tributaries: "At last," he says, "the kings of the Thebaid and of the other parts of Egypt rose up against the Shepherds, and there followed a great and long war, which ended in their expulsion." "Μετὰ ταῦτα τῶν ἐκ τῆς Θηβαίδος καὶ τῆς ἄλλης Αἰγύπτου βασιλέων γενέσθαι φησὶν ἐπὶ τοῖς Ποιμένας δουλοποιεῖσιν," κ.τ.λ. And still more precisely in an hieratic MS., approaching in antiquity to the time itself, it is said that at the moment, seemingly, when independence was first asserted there was *only one* native king surviving in all Egypt, besides the Shepherd Apophis at Avaris; and that one was a king named Raskennen, who reigned in Upper Egypt; the same, no doubt, whose name (found also in the list of Eusebius) stands last in the lowest line on the left hand side of the Karnak Chamber.

This then being clear both from the fictitious spaces in which many of Manetho's dynasties are arranged, and from direct testimony of others, and even of Manetho himself, it is next to be noticed that the *limits* within which all the concurrent dynasties of early times were confined are open to no doubt; for all agree that a single monarchy for all Egypt was founded by Menes. So no secondary dynasty can be made to begin before his; nor is it probable perhaps that any one began until after his death. On the other hand it is a point equally agreed upon that the kings of Dyn. XVIII united all Egypt, and Nubia too, under a single sceptre; and we see them on the monuments all wearing indifferently the two crowns of the Upper and Lower country, and the imperial crown or *pschent* compounded out of them both. But the space between the accession of Menes and that of Amosis, head of Dyn. XVIII, consists according to the Chronicle of 190 + 103 + 184, in all 477 years, of its Dynasties XVI, XVII, and XXVII, of Tanites, Memphites, and Shepherds.

In this space of 477 years the first point is to identify, if

possible, in Manetho's lists the three leading dynasties of the Chronicle; which done, we may try to place the other secondary dynasties. About the first there is no difficulty, Dyn. I of Africanus (VIII of Manetho) being clearly identical with the Tanite Dyn. XVI of the Chronicle. And, further, as these two dynasties, beginning from the same point, and having the same number of VIII kings, are absolutely coincident the one with the other, it appears from their collation that Manetho (the later author of the two) has added 63 years to the true length of the reigns, giving the eight kings an average of $31\frac{1}{2}$ years each, instead of one of $23\frac{1}{4}$ (somewhat below the ordinary average of $24\frac{1}{2}$) which they have in the Chronicle. And on examination it appears that Manetho has done nearly the same by all those first six dynasties of his kings (I to VI inclusively of Africanus) which really belong to Lower Egypt; these dynasties having in all 49 kings and 1491 years, which give over 30 years to each king.

Dyn. VIII.
viii Tanites,
190 years.
March 3, B.C.
2224, to Jan.
14, B.C. 2034.

The Memphite Dyn. XVII of the Chronicle cannot be identified with any *one* of the dynasties of Manetho; but from an examination and comparison of the list of Eratosthenes it appears that his informants understood it to consist of two kings and 39 years taken from Dyn. X of Manetho (III of Africanus), or from the uppermost line on the left side of the Karnak Chamber, of one king, Papa Maire, from Dyn. XIII of Manetho (VI of Africanus), or from the second line on the left side of the Karnak Chamber, with the last 22 years of his long reign, and of one king, Sesortasen I, with 42 years, from Dyn. XV of Manetho (XII of Africanus). And the monuments justify this succession, showing clearly that Papa Maire and Sesortasen at least (to say nothing of Sahoura and Snefru) were sovereigns of all Egypt before the domination of the Shepherds; and Herodotus names Mœris as the immediate predecessor of the conqueror of Ethiopia.

Passing over Dyn. XVII, and coming to XXVII of the Chronicle, this again is easily identified with Dyn. XV of Africanus (XVII of Manetho). And after having detected Manetho adding to the years of Dyn. XVI of the Chronicle, one might suppose that here also the 259 years and 10 months of the six kings should be reduced to 184, the sum

of the Chronicle. But there are signs against this; for it is most *probable* that the Chronicle had only *four* generations to the 184 years of its Dyn. XXVII, and *three* to its Dyn. XXIX; and the additions made by Manetho to the first six of his dynasties, all that belong to Lower Egypt, are followed by curtailments in the next three (XI, XII, XIV of Africanus) belonging to Upper Egypt: and after this he would scarcely begin again to exaggerate merely to do honour to the Shepherds, nor favour them above native Thebans, even though these latter were from Upper and the Shepherds from Lower Egypt. It is also more probable that the Shepherds had been for some time settled in the Delta when they became dominant, than that they came in as invaders and took Memphis at once. It is safer, therefore, to let the figures of Dyn. XVII of Manetho (XV of Africanus) stand as they are, and to suppose that only the last 184 years of its last four reigns correspond to Dyn. XXVII of the Chronicle.

Eratosthenes, a great authority, having been persuaded to add to the times of the monarchy the xv generations or 443 years "of the Cycle" thrown up by the Chronicle, in spite of the difficulty of transposing them so as to stand below Menes, and of blending them with the coherent series of dynasties into which they were to be interpolated, it is natural to inquire whether then there was really any great difficulty in placing all Manetho's ten dynasties anterior to Dyn. XVIII in the space of 477 years? In order to examine this question fairly the first six dynasties of Manetho must, as a general rule, be reduced from his exaggerated average of life-generations of above 30 years each to reigns of $24\frac{1}{2}$ years each, the average of the Chronicle and of Eratosthenes; and the three dynasties of Upper Egypt which follow will have to receive a proportionate expansion.

Dyn. IX.
ix Tanites,
174 years.
Jan. 14, B.C.
2034, to Dec.
27, B.C. 1861;
or, Jan. 20,
B.C. 2095, to
Dec. 17, B.C.
1922?

The first dynasty of Tanite Kings, after its 190 years, might well enough be succeeded in the same city by a second of the same lineage, or a younger branch beginning from the time when the Memphites became predominant. But in this case, after 103 years, or little more, we should expect it to cease, the Shepherds who then became masters residing in that part of the Delta, and the name of the last

Shepherd king being still visible in the ruins of Tanis. But the IX Kings of Manetho with the full average of $24\frac{1}{2}$ would have in all 220 years, continuing during 117 years under the Shepherds, which, though unlikely, is certainly *possible*, as the Shepherds made their own special residence not at Tanis, nor at Memphis, but at Avaris. In the list of Eratosthenes, however, the *last* two kings of Dyn. IX of Manetho (II of Africanus) are detached, and, being consolidated into one generation of 79 years, stand at the head of the earliest Memphite dynasty; while the remaining sum of the second dynasty of Tanites, 224, unreduced by Eratosthenes, is *indicated* as complete long after, viz. ten years after the commencement of the 184 years of the dominion of the Shepherds. Seemingly, too, Eratosthenes begins his Memphites with the first cartouche of the uppermost line on the left hand side of the Karnak chamber. His variation seems to correct a curious and gross blunder in the original compilation of Manetho's lists, as if Manetho, without attending to the truth of history or to the monuments, had either copied or miscopied from some hieratic MS., so as to put the rubric dividing his Dyn. VIII of Tanites from X of Memphites two names too low, making the head of the Memphites, who reigned perhaps no long time after the death of Menes, to become the last king but one of a dynasty which began long after his time. But even after accepting from Eratosthenes this correction, the VII kings who remain will claim $171\frac{1}{2}$ years, and will last 68 into the time of the Shepherds, or, it might be, somewhat less, if the actual reigns fell short of the usual average. Another idea is suggested by the fact that the end of this dynasty is indicated by Eratosthenes only 10 years after the end of Dyn. III of Africanus, viz., that though it be called Tanite, this designation may be used in a wide sense, like those of Memphite and Diospolite afterwards, and may mean only that its kings were by origin and locality connected with Tanis, and with that part of the Delta of which Tanis was the capital; not that they actually reigned in the same city with the kings of Dyn. I of Africanus. But perhaps, for example, there were two cities of Tanis, divided by the water, as Memphis and Heliopolis

were separated, with a greater interval, by the Nile; and these may have had at once two lines of kings. In this case the VII kings of the second dynasty of Thinites (Tanites), if their actual average equalled $24\frac{1}{2}$ years, may have commenced 58 years before the end of the first dynasty, and may have ended, as Eratosthenes hints they did, 10 years after the end of Dyn. III of Africanus, and 10 therefore also after that of Dyn. XVII of the Chronicle.

Dyn. X.
ix Memphites,
204. Feb. 11,
B.C. 2145, to
Dec. 20, B.C.
1932.

Dyn. III of Africanus (X of Manetho) the first of Memphites, is clearly paralleled by Eratosthenes, and its IX kings seem to be identified by him with the earliest names on the left hand side of the Karnak chamber. According to the general average they might claim 220 years, but Manetho gives them only 214, which is probably then their actual number.

Dyn. XI.
viii Memphites,
174. Dec. 20,
B.C. 1932, to
Nov. 6, 1756.

And Dyn. IV of Africanus (XI of Manetho) not only seems to follow III, but can be shown to have done so: and being thus connected with it, Dyn. IV helps much to fix the place of III, and the epoch of its commencement. In the lists of Eratosthenes the kings of Dyn. IV follow, as here, next after those of III, and occupy in Lower Egypt the chronological place of the Shepherds of Dyn. XXVII of the Chronicle. Herodotus says that they were impious and tyrannical, and that their memory was so odious, that the Egyptians would scarce name them if they could avoid it. Exactly the same is said by Manetho of the Shepherds, who are altogether omitted both on the monuments and in the lists of Eratosthenes, and are all but omitted by the Chronicle, while the kings of Dyn. IV also are omitted from the monumental succession in Upper Egypt. During their time Egypt, according to Herodotus, was subjected by destiny to a Typhonian influence; and the dominion of the Shepherds is connected by Manetho also with destiny and with a malignant deity; and the city of Avaris, where they lived, and the whole region of the Sethroitic arm of the Nile, is according to him Typhonian, the special province of Typhon. The Memphite kings of Dyn. IV, according to Herodotus and Manetho, built the pyramids; and according to Herodotus the same pyramids were *also* ascribed to the Shepherd Philiton, who contemporaneously fed his flocks "in those parts," i.e. in Lower Egypt.

Lastly, in Manetho's heading of Dyn. IV, naming it Memphite, it is added "of another lineage," i. e. *not* a continuation of Dyn. III, which they are implied to have succeeded. And in Dyn. XV it is noticed of the Shepherds that they "took Memphis;" and elsewhere it is implied that native rulers, not only in the Thebaid but in the rest of Egypt, were continued under the Shepherds; so that if, as was natural, they put nominees and creatures of their own into the place of that Memphite family which they had violently dispossessed, one understands how the kings of Dyn. IV came to be "of another lineage," and so to constitute a new dynasty, and how their memory in later times shared the odium attaching to that of the Shepherds. And though such great works as the pyramids at Memphis or the labyrinth in the Fayoum may suggest an idea that the kings who built them must have been sovereigns of all Egypt, this idea has no real cogency. On the contrary, the peculiar circumstances of the famine, and the permanent changes occasioned by it, may well account for the fact that under the kings of Dynasties IV and XII of Africanus public works in Egypt suddenly assume gigantic proportions, and that, from that time forth, the kings become more absolute, and have greater multitudes of men at their disposal both for civil and for military service. On the other hand the "Ethiopian stone," i. e. the granite, used for casing the third pyramid hints that the Suphises and Mencheres lived after the conquest of Nubia, and not before those kings Moeris and Sesostris (i. e. Papa Maire and Sesortasen I.), whose predecessors "had done nothing remarkable." But if the eight kings of Dyn. IV of Africanus, who might claim 198 years, are to be reduced so as to cover only the 184 of the Shepherds, or somewhat less, and Dyn. III of Africanus cannot be supposed to continue after the capture of Memphis and the commencement thereupon of the Shepherd domination, it follows, that the commencement of the 214 years of Dyn. III must be put up 111 years before the end of Dyn. I of Africanus; that is, it will have commenced about 79 years after the accession of Menes, a date not at all improbable.

Dynasty V of Africanus (XII of Manetho), which, with Dyn. XII.
ix East Bank

Memphites? 228 years.
 Feb. 12, a.c. 2149, to Dec. 17, a.c. 1923;
 or, Jan. 1, a.c. 1962, to Nov. 5, a.c. 1754.

its IX kings, must be reduced from 248 to 220 [228 or 218] years, having a separate designation (*ἡ Ελεφαντίνη*), causes no difficulty. Its kings were certainly connected with Memphis (for their names occur mixed with those of Dynasty IV of Africanus in the tombs about the pyramids), and if they reigned at Heliopolis they might be regarded as Memphites of the *East* bank; for "*Abt*," the Egyptian word for the east, is also the name of Elephantine. Since they are a separate line, there is no difficulty in supposing them to have commenced at any date not earlier than the commencement of Dynasty III; and this is a point on which light can be thrown only by the monuments, or by hieratic papyri. But if they began later, and lasted together with the Memphites of Dynasty IV through, or almost through, the 184 years of the Shepherds, they would have begun 36 or 34 years before the termination of Dynasty III of Africanus (X of Manetho), and also 36 or 34 before the termination of Dynasty XVII of the Chronicle.

Dyn. XIII.
 vi Memphites, 167 years.
 Feb. 8, a.c. 2152, to Dec. 27, a.c. 1961.

Dynasty VI, again, of Africanus, though called Memphite, must be a separate line by itself, both because we have already had one succession of Memphites reaching down to Dynasty XVIII; and also because it is separated from that succession in Manetho's lists by a dynasty with another designation. So the name "Memphite" is used in a wide sense. And, in fact, the monuments connect the kings of this dynasty chiefly with central Egypt, while from the lists of Eratosthenes it is found to contribute one name, that of Phiops with his last 22 years, to make the third of the four Memphite generations of Dynasty XVII of the Chronicle. And the monuments mark the 18th year of the sovereignty of this king *over all Egypt*; which sufficiently shows that he reigned before the Shepherds and their Memphite contemporaries, of Dynasties XV and IV of Africanus. If we let the last three reigns of this dynasty stand as actual reigns, only with 94 not 100 years to Phiops, and reduce the first three, in conformity with the average of $24\frac{1}{2}$, to $73\frac{1}{2}$ years, the whole dynasty having then $180\frac{1}{2}$ years ending 29 years before the end of Dynasty XVII of the Chronicle, it must be supposed to have begun $110\frac{1}{2}$

years before the end of Dyn. I of Africanus, i. e. only 79½ or 77 after Menes, in the very same year, perhaps, according to our scale of averages, with the earliest Memphite dynasty, the two being a double offshoot, at one and the same point, from the trunk line of Tanis. As for the notice of Manetho that Nitocris, the last name in Dynasty VI of Africanus, "built the third pyramid," this is of no weight, since we know both that it was the purpose of Manetho to present all the dynasties as successive, and that, whenever it suited his purpose to make them so, his assertions are fabulous. Still, since even falsehood must have had some source, one may reasonably inquire after the source of this notice; and we may perhaps find it, if we put together the following facts:—Herodotus was told that the third pyramid was built by Mycerinus; and rightly, for his name and sarcophagus have been found in it. He says, also, that some pretended it was built by a certain beauty named Rhodopis (compare the words *ῥοδοπιάτῃ, ξανθῇ τὴν χρῶλαν*, in the lists), of the times of the Saïtes of Dyn. XXVI. He saw himself "*at Saïs*" the wooden coffin, in the form of a cow, of the daughter of King *Mycerinus*, whom he naturally identified with the builder of the third pyramid, whereas, in truth, it was a Saïte king of Dyn. XXVI, who had taken to himself exceptionally the name of Mencheres; and two *Nitocrises*, mother and daughter, appear in the same family as Pallades, and as connected with the kings Necho II. and Psammitichus II.; and with the latter of these two kings, the Greek name of Doricha or Rhodopis also seems to be connected. The pyramid of Mycerinus is said to be of double construction, as if a smaller pyramid, built for one sepulchre, had afterwards been made the nucleus of a larger. The reign of Mycerinus having been cut short according to Herodotus, this agrees with the idea that his pyramid might be enlarged and finished afterwards, perhaps by his daughter, perhaps by a queen such as Amessis, certainly not by Nitocris of Dyn. VI. But it is to be remarked that Manetho, having given Mycerinus a reign of 66 years, long enough to complete any one of the pyramids, says not of Nitocris that she *finished*, but simply that she built, "*ἡγάγετο*," the third pyra-

mid, which is a plain falsehood, blending well with the Greek story of Rhodopia, but contradicted both by Herodotus and by the pyramid itself. However, if any one wish to make the best of the case for Manetho, and if the construction of the pyramid admit of the hypothesis, it is open for him to imagine that Nitocris of Dyn. VI of Africanus may have "built" a small pyramid (since pyramids were built from the time of the third successor of Menes), which afterwards became the nucleus of "the third pyramid" built and completed, under Dyn. IV of Africanus, by Mencheres. And though it is true that the use of granite can be traced as high as the time of Papa Maire (the Mœris of Herodotus),—for he is said by Pliny ("Phios and Smarres," he writes the names) to have set up two plain obelisks, of no great size, still perhaps to be seen at Rome, and an altar of black basalt, bearing his name, is preserved in the museum at Turin,—still it is not likely that the use of "Ethiopic stone," such as partly faced the third pyramid, was introduced on any great scale before the time of Sesortasen I., the successor of Papa-Maire as sovereign of all Egypt, and the first conqueror of Nubia.

Dyn. XIV.
xvi Diospo-
lites, 392.
Feb. 10, B.C.
89, to Nov.
B.C. 1748.

To come now to the three dynasties of Upper Egypt, XI, XII, and XIV (as it seems) of Africanus, numbered XIV, XV, and XVI by the original Manetho:—For the earliest Diospolite dynasty, Dyn. XIV of Manetho (XI of Africanus,) the number of kings given is XVI; and a series of XIII names, probably representing these, and nearly justifying the number, appears on the left-hand side of the Karnak Chamber, with a shorter line, viz., the kings of Dyn. XII of Africanus, following one another in a contrary order, interposed in the midst of them. The XIII names are—1. A prince named *Enantef* or *Nantef* (which in Greek might be *Enantæus* or *Myrtæus*): his name alone, of them all, is not inclosed in a cartouche. 2. *Mentuhotep I.* (perhaps the same whose throne-name is *Ra-neb-teti*). 3. *Enantef II.* 4. *Enantef III.* (whose other name perhaps is known). 5. Perhaps (for the name is not preserved) *Enantef IV.*, with the addition *Aa*, and the throne-name *Ra-tap-ma-kherp*; for the sarcophagi of two of these kings, brothers, the one of whom buried the

other, have been found at Thebes, and with other objects from the same tomb, bearing their names, are now in the museums of London, Paris, and Leyden. 6. *Enantef V.*, *Raher-per-ma-kherp*, whose sarcophagus is preserved. 7. Perhaps *Mentuhotep II.* (for this name is again effaced). 8. *Ra-s-neferkar*. 9. *Ra-neb-cheru* (whose family name, elsewhere found conjoined with this, is *Mentuhotep III.*; his 44th year is marked on a stele from Abydos in the Turin museum, and in one of the monumental lists at Thebes, at the Ramesseum, his name appears as the sole intermediate link between Menes and Amosis head of Dyn. XVIII). 10. *Ra-nub-cheper* (whose family name, elsewhere conjoined with this, is *Enantef*). 11. *Tseser-en-ra* (the same name with that of a Memphite king of Dyn. III of Africanus, who built one of the pyramids). 12. *Sescht-en-ra* (to whom Bunsen gives the family name *Aah-hotep*). 13. *Ra-s-kennen*, whose family name is *Taanaken*, and who is known to have been the immediate predecessor of Amosis, the founder of Dyn. XVIII. There are also on the monuments two or three other names seemingly connected with these, such as *Ra-spen-neb*, *Ka-mes*, and an earlier *Ra-s-kennen*, which will bring up the list to the full number of sixteen kings.

But these XVI kings have in fact *no years* assigned to them by Manetho; for the 43 years nominally given to them are probably intended only to mark off so many years really belonging to Dyn. XII of Africanus but detached because after those 43 years the remaining kings of the dynasty were no longer lords of Memphis and of all Egypt. Else, to divide 43 years between XVI kings, giving less than 2 years and 8 months to each, and that too after all their predecessors have averaged something over 31 years each, is plainly absurd. But if we give them $24\frac{1}{2}$ each, the full average of the Chronicle and Eratosthenes, they will cover 392 years. And supposing them to end, as the monuments seem to show that they did end, immediately before the commencement of Dyn. XVIII, they will even so have begun as early as the 85th year after Menes, that is, very little later than the other two branch-lines from the original trunk of Tanis, viz., that of the Memphites of Memphis itself,

and that of the Memphites of Central Egypt, Dyn. III and Dyn. VI of Africanus; for we need not now speculate about the date of the origin of his Dyn. V.

Dyn. XV.
viii Diospo-
lites, 191.
Jan. 3, B.C.
1989, to Nov.
17, B.C. 1799.

The VII kings of Dyn. XV of Manetho (XII of Africanus) are also named Diospolite; and we have seen that the first of them, Sesortasen I., is shown by the list of Eratosthenes to make the last of the four "Memphite" generations of Dyn. XVII of the Chronicle. The monuments justify both designations, connecting, on the one hand, Sesortasen I. with the earlier Memphite kings Siserirenra and Aan; and on the other showing that Thebes itself was not the ordinary residence either of himself, or of his co-regents Amenemhe I. and II., or of his successors of Dyn. XII of Africanus, but was ruled by a line of local kings (Dyn. XI of Africanus) of secondary importance, while the monuments and tombs of the later kings of Dyn. XII appear rather in the Fayoum. Still, after they had lost the sovereignty over Memphis and Lower Egypt, they might rightly be called Diospolites, as sovereigns of all *Upper Egypt*; as before, for some similar reason, they were styled Memphites.

According to Manetho the VII kings of his Dyn. XV (Dyn. XII of Africanus) have 160 years, with average reigns of nearly 23 years each, Amenemhe I. (counting whom there would be VIII kings with 176 years, and an average of 22 years to each) being named only as an appendage to the preceding dynasty. But in the Turin papyrus the VIII kings of this dynasty, Amenemhe I. being the first, have a sum of 213 years, 1 month, and 17 days. The separate reigns, as partly still legible in the papyrus, partly restored conjecturally by comparison of such traces as remain in the papyrus with the Greek lists, should succeed one another in some such way as follows:—

16. Jan. 3, B.C.
1989, to Dec.
30, B.C. 1974;
or 4, to Jan. 1,
B.C. 1980.

I. *Amenemhe I., Ra-s-hotep-het.*—The papyrus, after the sign for years, and seemingly in direct connection with it, in fragment No. 64, retains distinct traces of the number ix. (Bunsen quotes Seyffarth for [x]ix, but there is neither any trace of a x, nor appearance of room for it) Manetho gives only xvi years. In an inscription on a stele now at Paris, "the 8th year" is named in connection with two kings at

once, Amenemhe I. and Sesortasen I.; and again in another inscription, also at Paris, the "9th year of Sesortasen I." is marked, the name of Amenemhe I. also, but without any other titles, being prefixed. Hence it seems that whether Amenemhe I. reigned in all only 16, or more from some earlier accession, he had for his last 7 years *at least*, perhaps even for the full 16 years, Sesortasen I. for his colleague on the throne of Upper Egypt, where he appears originally as contemporary with, and as some think subordinate to a king named Mentuhotep (whom we have placed in Dyn. XI of Africanus). Eratosthenes seemingly gave these two kings Amenemhe I. and Sesortasen I. under two names (Peteathyres and another which has fallen out) as *two* of his *generations* numbered XXXI and XXXII, but with only *one* joint reign of 42 years, a sum, as we may infer, representing the whole time during which Sesortasen I., whether jointly with Amenemhe I. and II. or alone, was sovereign of all Egypt, after the death of Papa Maire. Of any earlier years which either Amenemhe I. may have reigned in Upper Egypt before Sesortasen became his colleague, or Sesortasen in Lower Egypt either before or after his alliance with Amenemhe I., whose daughter probably he married (since he is called Ἀμμενεμίδης), Eratosthenes takes no notice; but it is certainly quite possible that from their earliest accessions Amenemhe I. may have reigned 19 years or more, and Sesortasen I., not 42 only, or 45, or 46, but even 48 or 49 years. The 42 years of Eratosthenes are probably identical chronologically with the 43 given to the contemporary Dyn. XI of Africanus by Manetho, some fractional months and days, amounting nearly to half a year, having been cut off in compiling the one list, but filled up in the other.

II. *Sesortasen I., Ra-cheper-ka.*—In a fragment of the Turin papyrus, numbered 67, and supposed to have contained the figures for this and the four following reigns, there are traces, after the uppermost sign for "years," of the number xl, and most probably also of viii; certainly either of viii or v. (Bunsen gives the number xlv as "still legible.") Africanus gives this king only xlv years, which

48. Jan. 1, A.C. 1980, to Dec. 20, A.C. 1933. Or 42, Dec. 31, A.C. 1974, to Dec. 20, A.C. 1932. Erat.

would agree well with Bunsen's reading of the papyrus, if we suppose that the papyrus made xlv years, and a fraction exceeding vi months. It appears that in his 41st or 42nd year he associated his successor, as there is an inscription which names conjointly the 44th year of Sesortasen I. and the 3rd year of Amenemhe II. The xlii years then given by Eratosthenes to Amenemhe I. and Sesortasen I. jointly, if they end at the death of the latter, include the first five at least of Amenemhe II., who in that case might be reckoned chronologically to reign only 33 instead of 38 years. The xlii years begin probably, as has been said above, from the date when Sesortasen I. became sovereign of all Egypt, which we collect from Eratosthenes, and indirectly also from Herodotus, was upon the death of Papa Maire. And it may be that his alliance and union with Amenemhe I. was either made in the same year with this event, or a few years before.

26. Dec. 22,
s.c. 1940, to
Dec. 13, s.c.
1902. Or 23,
Dec. 20, s.c.
1932, to Dec.
14, s.c. 1909.
Erat.

III. *Amenemhe II., Ra-nub-karu.*—In the papyrus, after the sign for years, there is the greater part of a sign which, when perfect, must have been either x, xx, or xxx, followed, it may be, by units, and by fractional months and days. We may conjecture that the sum of the years marked was [xx]x[viii], so as to agree with the number in the lists of Africanus. Colonel Felix concluded from a stele which he saw at Alexandria, but which unhappily has been lost since, that Amenemhe II. was son of Amenemhe I., whence Bunsen argues that Sesortasen I. and Amenemhe II. were brothers: but this would not follow merely because Sesortasen I. is called "son" of Amenemhe (he might be son-in-law); and it is sufficiently disproved by the fact that Amenemhe II. was associated by Sesortasen I. only in his 41st or 42nd year, and reigned himself 38 years afterwards. It is true that Eratosthenes gives him only xxiii years, but this is perhaps an error, since the monuments mark his 35th year: and further, by marking the concurrence of his 3rd year with the 44th of Sesortasen, and that of his 35th with the 3rd of Sesortasen II., they seem to forbid any deduction from the 38 years of his whole reign beyond 5 or 6 imperfect years of concurrence with Sesortasen I. (if Sesortasen reigned xlv and some months), and 6 years, possibly with some months over, which

might be reckoned as 7 imperfect years, at most, of concurrence with Sesortasen II. But after deducting 5 or 6, and 6 or 7, there still remain 26 years during which he should have reigned alone. But if we reckon xlviii years to Sesortasen I. with perhaps a fraction over (and this seems rather than xlv to have been the reading of the papyrus), then perhaps cutting off 8 or 9 years from the beginning, and 7 or 6 from the end of his xxxviii, we may just succeed in reducing the time that Amenemhe II. reigned alone to the xxiii years allowed him by Eratosthenes.

If, as is possible, though the name Concharis cannot be connected with him, Amenemhe II. be the king really alluded to under the names "Timæus" and "Concharis," in whose time according to Manetho (in his 5th year Syncellus has it) "the Shepherds" became the chief power in Egypt, it results that this change took place either immediately on the death of Sesortasen I., or within one year after it.

IV. *Sesortasen II., Ra-sha-cheper.* — The papyrus has clearly xix years, possibly with some fractional months and days after them. On the monuments his 11th year has been found; and, according to Sir G. Wilkinson, his 3rd year is named as coinciding with the 35th of Amenemhe II., in an inscription at Assouan. If so, his first year should be concurrent with the 33rd, or possibly in part with the 32nd, of his father. And the text of Eratosthenes' list giving only xxiii years to Amenemhe II., reckons, as it seems, his full xix to Sesortasen II., whom with Sesortasen III. it consolidates into one generation with lv years.

19. Dec. 14,
B.C. 1908, to
Dec. 9, B.C.
1890.

V. *Sesortasen III., Ra-sha-karu, or Khakaru* (Concharis?). The papyrus has certainly xxx, and we may suppose that it had v besides in the place for units, since it is clear that the thirty-third generation of Eratosthenes, with lv years, is a consolidation of these two kings; and, even with his full xix to Sesortasen II., xxxvi must be given to Sesortasen III. to make up the number. Manetho, in the lists of Africanus, seems to transpose these two kings, putting down Sesortasen II., under the name of Lachares, with only viii years, to follow after Sesortasen III., to whom, under the name of Sesostris, he gives xlviii (ascribing to him at

26. Dec. 9,
B.C. 1890, to
Nov. 30, B.C.
1854.

the same time acts belonging to Sesortasen I. and to Rameses II. and III.). However, the joint sum of his two reigns (viii + xlviii =) lvi, scarcely differs from that made by Eratosthenes, and may be reconciled with it, if only we suppose one of the two sums viii and xlviii, of which it is composed, to have been obtained originally by rounding off a fraction. The monuments are said to have supplied as yet no later date of his reign than the 14th year. It is to be observed further that in the series of the Karnak Chamber either one of these two kings consolidated by Eratosthenes (and, if either of them, it should be Sesortasen II. who has the shorter reign) is omitted, or else Amenemhe III. is omitted, which the length of his reign and the greatness of its monuments makes unlikely, unless there was some special ill-will to his memory, like that which has caused the omission of the Memphite pyramid-builders from the monumental lists.

49. from Dec.
2, A.C. 1860,
or 43 from
Nov. 30, A.C.
1854, to Nov.
20, A.C. 1811.
Erat.

VI. *Amenemhe III., Ra-en-ma.*—The papyrus has plainly xl years, and perhaps also viii in the place of units, so as to vary as little as possible from Manetho, whose list gives him, under the name Ammeres, viii years. And this may be correct for the units; but the monuments marking a 44th and even a 45th year of the reign, show clearly that four decades have been omitted. (For the knowledge of the 45th year of this king, marked in an inscription at Sarabeit el Khadeem, the writer is indebted to Mr. Birch of the British Museum.) In the lists of Manetho, as given by Eusebius, though he seems in general to have merely copied, or else to have altered for himself in copying from Africanus, there is a remarkable variant. For, after the two kings answering to Sesortasen II. and III., though in inverted order, he ceases, after his slovenly manner, to transcribe the names, and gives in general terms to “their successors” (*οἱ δὲ τούτων διάδοχοι*), a space of xlii years, made perhaps by doubling each of the two reigns of viii years, and adding the iv of the last reign of the dynasty. And in these earlier dynasties (earlier, that is, than Dyn. XVI of the Chronicle), Eusebius has not the same reason as below (though he still has *some* reason) for making arbitrary alterations.

At any rate, he would have seemed to come very near to Eratosthenes, if only he had given his xlii years to the two Amenemhes III. and IV., instead of including also under them another reign, the last of the dynasty. For, in the list of Eratosthenes Amenemhe III., under the name Mares, with xliii years, makes the last of a series plainly taken from the same kings as belong to Dyn. XII. of Africanus; and as Amenemhe III. and IV. were certainly colleagues for some part at least of the reign of the latter, if not for its whole duration (their names being found conjoined more than once in the same inscriptions), it is not unlikely that the two are consolidated in the list of Eratosthenes into a single generation. And in the series of the Karnak chamber, where Amenemhe IV. is still to be seen, Amenemhe III., as some think, though he had by far the longer reign of the two, is omitted altogether. But if we would reconcile the xliii years given to Amenemhe III. (with or without Amenemhe IV.) by Eratosthenes, with the xlv at least shown to be his by the inscription at Sarabeit el Khadeem, or with the xlviii which we have made for him by uniting the decades of the Turin MS. of Eratosthenes and of the monuments with the units of Manetho, we must suppose that Amenemhe III. was associated by Sesortasen III. some five or six years before his death.

VII. *Amenemhe IV., Ra-ma-khru*, ix years + iii months + xxvii days, according to fragment No. 72 of the papyrus, which for the two last reigns of the dynasty, and for its sum, has still all the figures for the years, months, and days perfect. Nevertheless in the lists of Africanus this king has only viii years instead of ix, a difference which is easily accounted for, if we suppose only one year of his reign, or a little more, to have been concurrent with the last part of the reign of Amenemhe III., after whose death he reigned on 8, or something less than 8, years alone. But if this were so, we must no longer suppose Amenemhe IV. to be consolidated into one generation with his predecessor in the list of Eratosthenes. Or, again, it is conceivable that both Amenemhe III. and IV., if they were brothers, were associated or made district kings under Sesortasen III., and

9 from Nov.
30, B.C. 1812,
or 8 from
Nov. 30, B.C.
1811, to Nov.
18, B.C. 1803.
Erat.

that Amenemhe III. reigned on *xliii*, Amenemhe IV. only *viii* years after the death of their father.

4. Nov. 18,
B.C. 1803, to
Nov. 17, B.C.
1799.

VIII. *Scemiophris, or Ra-Sebeknefru*, *iii* years + *x* months + *iv* days, according to the papyrus. In the Manetho of Africanus, the reign is filled up to *iv* years. In the list of Eratosthenes, who had only a limited number of generations into which to compress all the kings of whatever dynasty whom he named or alluded to, the last two reigns of Dyn. XII. of Africanus are unnoticed, and the compilers of his series pass to kings of another lineage.

Thus the sum given by the papyrus at the end of the dynasty in fragment No. 72 (*viz.* *ccxiii* years + *i* month + *xvii* days) may be exhibited by adding up the eight separate reigns, as still recoverable from fragments 64 and 67, or filled up conjecturally by comparison with other authorities. For in whole years the eight reigns ($9 + 48 + 38 + 19 + 36 + 48 + 9 + 3$) have 210 years: we know that the fractional months and days of the last two reigns add 1 year 2 months, and 1 day; and we may presume that the fractional months and days of the six earlier reigns, if we had them, would make up the 1 year + 11 months + 16 days that are still wanting.

If Amenemhe I. were separated in the papyrus, as he is in the lists of Manetho, the sum of the papyrus for the remaining VII kings would be 205 years. That of Manetho in the lists of Africanus for these same VII kings is only 160 years. But with the addition of the *xvi* of Amenemhe I., appended to Dyn. XI, and of the other *xliii* which we suppose to be only nominally attached to the *xvi* kings of the same Dyn. XI, but really to represent the reign of Sesortasen I., we have 219 years, reconcilable perhaps with the sum of 213 given by the papyrus for all the reigns of the dynasty. But Eratosthenes, omitting all merely concurrent years, makes from the beginning of the 8th year of the 49 imperfect of Sesortasen I. (which should be 42 full years before the end of Dyn. XVII of the Chronicle), that is, from Thoth 1, or Dec. 30 in B.C. 1974, to the death of Amenemhe III., a sum of 163 years (which would need an addition of three more years to Amenemhe II., if Sesortasen I.

reigned not 48 but only 45 years and some months: and then instead of 163 we should have 166 years). Again, if to 163 or 166 we prefix ($9 + 7 =$) 16 years, and append for the last two reigns of the dynasty ($8 + 4 =$) 12 years unnoticed by Eratosthenes, we shall have 191 or 194 chronological years; and the dynasty will begin from Jan. 3, B.C. 1989, and will reach to Nov. 17, B.C. 1799, 133 years after the commencement of the ascendancy of the Shepherds by the capture of Memphis, 1 year before the death of the patriarch Joseph, and 51 years before the expulsion of the Shepherds by Amosis, or at least before his coronation at Memphis. But that it really ended, whether then or a little earlier or later, without reaching down to the war with the Shepherds, appears also from the monuments (see the "Tomb of Aahmes," illustrated by M. de Rougé), and from an hieratic papyrus already mentioned more than once, which show that at the beginning of the war of independence only one native prince, named Ra-s-kennen, and he the last of Dyn. XI of Africanus, not of XII, was reigning in Upper Egypt. The 30 remaining years of Amenemhe II. from the end of his 8th (or 33 from the end of his 5th) year would seem to end in B.C. 1902; and the 19 of Sesortasen II. beginning in B.C. 1909, would end in B.C. 1890, 12 years before the exaltation of Joseph. So the thirty-seven Asiatics (Aamou) who are represented in a tomb at Beni-Hassan with their wives and children and asses bowing down and bringing gifts of game taken in hunting, in the 6th year of Sesortasen II., would seem to have submitted themselves to be "bondsmen" in B.C. 1903, 34 years before the family of Jacob came into Egypt. The 36 years of Sesortasen III., if they commenced from after the full 19 of Sesortasen II. in B.C. 1890 would end in B.C. 1854; and the seven years of famine, during which, as we suppose, it was that Upper Egypt also became subject to the Shepherds, would lie between his 19th and his 26th year, B.C. 1871—1864. So his victory over the frontier tribes, read by some Pennou, in Nubia, which is recorded by an inscription at Semneh and connected with the 21st day of Pharmouthi the eighth month,

and, *as it is said*, also with the celebration of one of the three season-festivals, and with the 8th year of the king, should be fixed to July 26th of the Julian year B.C. 1882 anticipated, without the Gregorian correction; since this should be the 8th year of the reign; and Thoth 1 was then at Dec. 8. But how Pharmouthi 21 = July 26, being the 10th day before the 1st of the ninth month Pachons, then at August 5th, should have been then the day of a season-festival, or how that season of the year at which it then was should have been suitable for gaining any victory, is not apparent.

If there be here no error, it is the actual observation of Sirius which seems to be indicated as fixing the recurrence of the festival of the summer season, though the date specified, July 26, is five or six days too *late* for it, the first appearance of Sirius being taken for the latitude of Memphis, or a little higher, to be at July 20.

According to M. Biot the heliacal rising of Sirius, which in B.C. 3285, and on Pachons 1 (had the Egyptian months then existed), coincided with the solstice and with the rise of the Nile, might be taken practically to coincide with the same for 500 years on either side of that date, though, as time went on, Sirius rose at an increasing interval after the solstice. In B.C. 2783, he says, that is 315 years after the Flood, the interval between the solstice and the heliacal rising of Sirius (then at Thoth 1) was as yet only 3 days; so that the first settlers of the Delta may well have taken the appearance of Sirius to mark the commencement of the season. Ten centuries later (after 1003 years and 8 months), that is, in B.C. 1780, when the movable Thoth had fallen back two whole seasons *of the zodiac*, and was at Nov. 12, the appearance of Sirius on the 20th July coincided with the 11th of Pachons, 10 or 11 days after the solstice; and Pachons 1 being equivalent to July 10, the *signification* of the Egyptian *tetramenia*, as expressed in hieroglyphics, then corresponded to the actual seasons. And in B.C. 1322, when the Sothic Cycle expired and was renewed, the interval, M. Biot says, between the summer solstice and the appearance of Sirius on July 20 amounted to as much as 14 or 15 days.

If, then, the Egyptians had still continued to attach the season-festival to the actual appearance of Sothis in the 19th century before Christ, though it was then 9 or 10 days later than the solstice, it would be easy to find the date of any year in which the festival of the summer season was marked at Pharmouthi 21. One would only have to count back the days from Thoth 1 to Pharmouthi 21, which are 135, and multiply these by 4; and then going back from B.C. 1322, when the appearance of Sirius was at Thoth 1, we should obtain the year B.C. $(135 \times 4 = 540)$ 1862, as that in which it was at Pharmouthi 21, which, however, seems to be the 18th, not the 8th year of Sesortasen III. Any error of a day or two in the actual observation, if it affected the date of the festival in any particular year, would make the date before Christ 4 or 8 years lower than this, not higher. And, in the same way, any difference of a more southern latitude affecting the date would also make it lower, not higher. So M. Biot makes a difference of 6 days between the appearance of Sirius at Memphis and its appearance at Syene: and so the epoch of the renewal of the Cycle, which is B.C. 1322 for Memphis, is put by him at B.C. 1302 for Thebes.

On the other hand, if it be supposed that the festival of the summer season was no longer in the 19th century before Christ conjoined with the appearance of Sothis, but rather with the solstice and the rise of the Nile as calculated and perceived by the Egyptians, then, if we take the year B.C. 1780, when Pachons 1 = July 10 nearly coincided, according to M. Biot, with the solstice, and go back 10 days from Pachons 1 to Pharmouthi 21, these 10, multiplied by 4, give us the number of years, viz. 40, which we must go back from B.C. 1780 in order to find the 10th of July and the solstice coinciding in Pharmouthi 21, and this we find in B.C. 1820. But if B.C. 1882 was the 8th year of Sesortasen III., and the season-festival was connected with the solstice, this being 62 years earlier than B.C. 1820, the date on the inscription ought to have been, not the 21st, but rather the 5th of Pharmouthi.

Possibly the addition of the 5 *ἐπαγόμεναι*, ascribed by one writer to Asseth, by another to Saïtes, and so probably

really made under the Shepherd kings with whom Sesortasen III. was contemporary, may have been made after his 8th year, perhaps about the year B.C. 1780, and may have been joined with some other change in the calendar. And hence there may be a difficulty in accounting for monumental dates of an earlier time. Or perhaps this particular date which has now detained us, if rightly read and rightly represented in all other respects, may have been connected not with a victory of Sesortasen in his 8th but with a victory or dedication in his 18th, or with a dedication by Amenemhe III., who should be on the throne in B.C. 1820. For his accession, after 55 years reckoned to his two predecessors, being according to Eratosthenes in B.C. 1854, his remaining 43 years (supposing him to have been previously associated for 6) will end in 1811. Then, if 8 are to be reckoned separately to Amenemhe IV., after less than 2 of association, those 8 will end in B.C. 1803; and the 4 of the last reign of the dynasty will end in B.C. 1799, 51 years before the commencement of Dyn. XVIII. But if Amenemhe IV. was altogether concurrent with Amenemhe III., the dynasty may have ended 8 years earlier, in B.C. 1809. Or again, on the other hand, it may have ended 4 years later than B.C. 1799 or than B.C. 1809, if there should be an error, and an error uncompensated, in the list of Eratosthenes, in giving only 23 chronological years to Amenemhe II., who may possibly have reigned 4 years only and some months with Sesortasen I., and the remaining months of that year and 27 years alone, and 6 more only with Sesortasen II. associated.

The great works commenced, according to Manetho, by Sesortasen III. (under the name Lachares, Lamares, or Lampares), and others ascribed elsewhere to Sesostris, with whom also Manetho identifies him, though in the *place* of his predecessor, and those certainly executed or completed by his successor, Amenemhe III., between B.C. 1854 and B.C. 1811, may be accounted for in like manner with those of the contemporary pyramid-builders of Memphis, by that change of relations between the kings and the populations subject to them which was consequent upon the famine.

The list of Eratosthenes being symmetrically arranged, so as, after the first 190 years of the Chronicle, to exhibit a period of 443 years twice over, once for Lower and once for Upper Egypt, the 443 of Lower Egypt being divisible into $156 + 184 + 103$, and the 443 of Upper Egypt into $103 + 184 + 156$, the bulk of the 184 years is made on the former side to consist of a representation of the Memphite Dyn. IV of Africanus, on the latter side of Dyn. XII, as shall be explained more at length hereafter. So Dyn. XII and Dyn. IV of Africanus, by this very fact, that they are placed parallel one to another, and over against one another, both of them representing the same 184 chronological years which in the Chronicle belong to the Shepherds, are covertly confessed by Eratosthenes' informants to have been contemporary with the Shepherds and with one another; and also to have been *tributary* to the Shepherds; since the Shepherds, according to the Chronicle, during those 184 years had the chief power in Egypt. Of their chronological displacement in the list of Eratosthenes (for they are thrust down so as even to invade the first 69 years of Dyn. XVIII) this is not the place to speak.

Dynasties XI
XV. XVII.
of Manetho
concurrent.

It has been said above that the XVI kings of Dyn. XI of Africanus, with the usual average of $24\frac{1}{2}$ years, ought to have begun before Dyn. XII of Africanus; and this they are known to have done; for one of the kings, named Nantef, is mentioned in an inscription as reigning in Upper Egypt three generations, that is, at least 90 years, before a certain date in the reign of Sesortasen I., viz. his 33rd year. Also it has been said that they ought to have lasted after the end of Dyn. XII even to the commencement of Dyn. XVIII; and this, again, seems to be confirmed by the monuments, as the left side of the Karnak Chamber shows VII kings of Dyn. XII (one king, either Sesortasen II. or Amenemhe III., being omitted) imbedded, as it were, in another Diospolite series of XIII names, the first of which is the Prince Nantef who has no cartouche, while the last is Ra-s-kennen the king who alone was reigning in Egypt at the commencement of resistance to the Shepherds. In the list of Eratosthenes, too, there are three other Theban names following,

as well as eight preceding, those of Dyn. XII of Africanus, though it may be doubted whether these three are any continuation of the kings of Dynasty XI of Africanus, since the last of Dyn. XI, Ra-s-kennen, ends the eight preceding. The later three may be suspected to be rather a representation of Dynasty XIV, i. e. of the kings on the right side of the Karnak Chamber, whom the Theban priests would not perhaps be likely to omit altogether, even though they had omitted one or two of the less important dynasties of *Lower Egypt*, viz. Dyn. II and Dyn. V of Africanus. The space to which they were limited by Eratosthenes, even with the admission of the "443 years of the Cycle," precluded, of course, any full exhibition of all the concurrent dynasties.

Dyn. XVI.
xxx Nubians
in three
lines? 216.
Dec. 28, B.C.
1966, to Nov.
4, B.C. 1760?
or somewhat
later?

We come next to the 184 years of Dyn. XVI of Manetho (XIV of Africanus), the kings of which we should have expected to find described as Nubian or Diospolitan, and in number not to exceed VIII or IX. Or, if the knowledge that Manetho was confined by his scheme within certain limits had prepared us to find three or four concurrent lines consolidated into a single dynasty, still, even then, four lines so consolidated would give no more, or certainly not many more, than xxx kings. But now we find in the text of Africanus a number of no less than LXXVI kings, and the designation Xoites, which sounds as if taken from a city of *Lower Egypt*, though perhaps, like the designations Elephantinite and Thinite, it may admit of being interpreted in a sense different from that which first suggests itself. For *Kes*, *Xoûs*, or Cush, being the name given by the Egyptians as well as by the Hebrews to the Nubians or Ethiopians, *Koûîrai*, or by metathesis of the vowel, *Ξοῖται*, might very well be formed from this name by any one who chose to turn it into Greek.

But whatever were the designations (whether Diospolites or Xoites), or the number of the kings (whether xxx, xxvi, or xxxvi), of that dynasty which stood as Dyn. XVI in the series of the original Manetho with the sum of 184 years, it must be supposed to have presented a distinct line, or several lines of one distinct family consolidated; and by the place that it holds in the lists its kings must have been

longed to Upper Egypt. For the fact that the Shepherds of Dyn. XVII (XV of Africanus) who lived in the Delta follow in the lists is no objection, seeing that these were strangers, and moreover suzerains of all Egypt, who would naturally be named, if they were named at all, after all the separate lines of native dynasties, and immediately before that sovereign dynasty which expelled them, and united all Egypt under a single sceptre. And since, out of three groups of Diospolite kings exhibited both separately on numerous monuments, and collectively on the left and right sides of the Karnak Chamber, two groups have already been identified with Dynasties XI and XII of Africanus (XIV and XV of Manetho), it follows that the remaining Diospolite or Xoite-Nubian dynasty of Manetho is probably the same as the remaining monumental group of the Sevekhotepts and Neferhoteps found on the right side of the Karnak Chamber. These kings appear to have been connected by blood with the lineage of Amenemhe I., and by locality with Upper Egypt and Nubia. As for their number, the whole series of the right side of the Karnak Chamber being only xxx, of whom half perhaps may have been found also on separate monuments, while lx (omitting one or two *princes*) may be the whole number of kings on *both* sides of the Karnak Chamber, it is probable that this may have been the source of the lx kings of Ptolemy of Mendes and Africanus; and that the original Manetho had not more than the half, i. e. xxx, if Dyn. XIII of Africanus was derived from his Dyn. XVI; or not more than xxxvi or xxvi, if Dyn. XIV, with its designation of Xoites and its doubtful number of lxxvi kings, was derived from his Dyn. XVI. The number lxxvi may probably have been derived from hieratic MSS. similar to that of Turin, in which the names of the Sevekhotepts and Neferhoteps appear with a prodigious multiplication of short reigns of one, two, or three, or at most five years each.

One may conjecture that the original Manetho, ejecting those names of the hieratic papyri which were merely genealogical, and perhaps making of them one division of his Manes, with their short "reigns" expanded into month-years, so

reduced the group or groups of these kings to something like the number exhibited on the right side of the Karnak Chamber. Then Ptolemy of Mendes, who even for his interpolations most probably used *some* materials, when he made two dynasties out of one, may have found it convenient to vary the designation, and may have purposely made the number of kings in the first dynasty of the two to correspond with that of the Karnak Chamber, and their number in the second to correspond with that of the same kings in the hieratic papyri. Or both the numbers LX and LXXVI may have been derived from two consecutive groups of royal names in the papyri, and the coincidence of the first number with that of the Diospolites of the Karnak Chamber *may* have been only accidental. Among the four mythological dynasties of Manes (whom we suppose to be royal names ejected from the hieratic papyri) of the original Manetho, besides two of Thinites and Memphites, there are two with 1817 and 5813 months, reducible respectively to 151 and 484 full years, which may have come from the Diospolite and Nubian genealogy of the same papyri. But $151 + 484$ years make a sum of 635, from which if we deduct the 184 given by the original Manetho to his Dyn. XVI (the years of the present Dyn. XIV of Africanus), there remain 451, agreeing within 2 with the sum of the interpolated Dyn. XIII of Africanus. And if we suppose the number of kings in those two dynasties of Diospolite and Nubian Manes in which it is not specified to be according to the same average as that which Manetho specifies for the Manes called Memphites, the 151 Diospolite and 484 Nubian years will give in all ($xxx + xcvi =$) $cxxvi$ kings, short by only ten of $cxxxvi$, which is the sum of the kings in the two Dynasties XIII and XIV of Africanus thrown together. Nor is even this seeming difference real; for in the remaining dynasty of Manes, where the number of x Thinite kings is specified, the average is lower than for the Memphites, being something under three full years instead of 5 to each king, so that we may well suppose that the number of kings of the Diospolite and Nubian Manes, had they been specified, would have made up together the full sum of $cxxxvi$, which is made by adding together

the kings of Dynasties XIII and XIV of Africanus. Not that we are to suppose that Ptolemy of Mendes followed any such process as we have been now following with the Manes of the original Manetho; but no doubt he took both the number of kings and the years of each king direct from the same hieratic papyri from which Manetho also had extracted and transposed them, when he multiplied their short reigns into month-years.

Assuming the number of kings in Manetho's Dyn. XVI (represented in its sum of years at least by Dyn. XIV of Africanus) to have been originally only xxvi or xxx, or xxxvi at the most, and taking xxx as the mean, thirty reigns, if consecutive, with the ordinary average of the Chronicle and Eratosthenes, viz. $24\frac{1}{2}$ years, would cover 735 years, whereas there are only 477 years between Menes and the head of Dyn. XVIII; and the Nubian kings cannot have commenced before the conquest of Nubia by Sesortasen I. But the accession of Sesortasen, at least to the sovereignty of all Egypt, being at B.C. 1974, 226 years before that of Amosis the founder of Dyn. XVIII, the interval from his conquest of Nubia was of course less. On the other hand, the 184 years of Manetho's Dyn. XVI would give to xxvi kings about 7 years each, to xxx scarcely more than 6, and to xxxvi only 5 years, to say nothing of the LX or LXXVI kings of the text of Ptolemy and Africanus, to whom it would give in the one case only three years, in the other less than two years and a half each; averages which suit well enough the numerous and short reigns of parts of the Turin papyrus, but which for actual historical reigns are altogether improbable. But the number of 184 years (like that of 43 given to the xvi kings of Dyn. XI of Africanus) is perhaps inserted merely as an allusion to something else which does not appear on the surface; and it is not to be supposed that the Nubian line or lines of kings so commenced in fact, and so ended, as to coincide exactly with the 184 years of supremacy reckoned by the Chronicle to the Shepherds from their capture of Memphis to the coronation of Amosis in the same city. Perhaps some light may be gained by putting together the following indications:—

First, on the left side of the Karnak Chamber there are, in XXXII cartouches, at least *four* lines of kings who reigned in Middle or Upper Egypt, in the Thebaid or north of the Thebaid; and these lines appear to have been more or less contemporaneous one with another. So by analogy we should expect the XXX names on the right side, especially as they are of less important kings, to be also divisible into three or four lines. Again, Nubia, after its conquest by Sesortasen I., is known to have received (either from him or from Sesortasen III.) an organisation similar to that of Egypt, being divided into an Upper and a Lower Country, each with Nomes of its own (and the division of Egypt itself into Nomes is by some ascribed to Sesortasen or Sesostris). It would be natural then that from some date in the joint reign of Amenemhe I. and Sesortasen I. rather than from the year in which the Shepherds took Memphis, i. e. during 216 or 214 perhaps rather than 184 years before Dyn. XVIII, Nubia should have had at least two lines of concurrent princes, one for the Upper and one for the Lower Country; while a third line of the same stock may have ruled towards the southern frontier of Egypt. And these, being of one lineage, may have been all consolidated by Manetho into one dynasty, to suit his limited number of XXXIII dynasties of kings, just as Eratosthenes is obliged to consolidate reigns and kings and allusions to whole dynasties, to suit his limited number of $(XV + LXXVI =) XCI$ generations, and his space of $(443 + 1881 =) 2324$ years. Again, as regards the Turin papyrus, though we suppose it to be rather a pedigree of regal families than a list of true reigns, and many of its kings to have been even infants who died young, or others who never actually reigned, but only stood for a time in the way of succession, or were the ancestors of such as succeeded afterwards, still, even so, the vast number of names given in the papyrus to this lineage as compared with others, implies not only that it was nearer to the time when the list was made, and important from some connection with the kings of Dyn. XVIII or XIX, then reigning, but also, over and above all this, that it must have been sub-divided into at least two or three concurrent lines. Putting the number of lines at only two, and

the kings of Manetho who actually reigned at xxx, so as to agree with the number on the right side of the Karnak Chamber, and their whole continuance at 216 instead of 184 years, 15 joint reigns would have an average of only $14\frac{1}{3}$ years each; whereas if we allow three lines, they would have the much more probable average of about $21\frac{1}{4}$ years, which is also more agreeable to the indications of the Karnak Chamber, and of other separate monuments, connecting several of these kings not only with Nubia, or with places of common interest, such as Abydos or Thebes, but with other localities between the Thebaid and the southernmost frontier of Nubia.

In Dyn. XVII of Manetho (XV of Africanus) if the vi Dyn. XVII. vi Shepherds. 260, from Jan. 8, B.C. 2007, or 184 from Dec. 20, B.C. 1932, to Nov. 4, B.C. 1748. Shepherd kings had 259 years and 10 months, as he gave them, and as it has been proposed above to allow, they will have commenced under the Memphite Dyn. XVII of the Chronicle (under that part of it which belongs to Dyn. III of Africanus), in B.C. 2007, 76 years before their capture of Memphis in B.C. 1932, the date from which they are reckoned by the Chronicle to have become paramount, or at least superior in some sense to any other dynasty still co-existing with them in Upper Egypt. This is certainly more probable than that they came into Egypt as hostile invaders, took Memphis at once, and contenting themselves with that conquest carried the war no further. We may even conjecture that their mode of living and acting together, and the ease with which they were used to move about, may have made them serviceable to the native kings under whom they first came in; that Sesortasen I. may have used them in gaining or asserting his supremacy, or in conquering Nubia; and that after his death they felt their power; the native Egyptians down to that time having had no considerable wars or armies; nor having their population so concentrated in cities as afterwards. In the Turin papyrus (fragment No. 30) there is a series of *figures* ("73, 72, 63, 95, 0, 95, 70, and [2]4 years") looking like the *lives* of 7 or 8 kings of a long-lived family, agreeing with such a series of long *reigns* as is ascribed to the Shepherds by Manetho; and the one or two short lives intermixed by no means lessen the probability that they really belong to this dynasty; while vestiges of four

or five *names* on another fragment, No. 112, look like those of strangers, and have the spaces between the lines agreeing well in width with those between the lines of the figures.

This perhaps is the place to consider an objection which may be brought from the monuments. They may be thought to prove not only that Sesortasen I. and his co-regent Amenemhe I. (who together make the first generation of Dyn. XII for Eratosthenes) were sovereigns of all Egypt, and no vassals of the Shepherds; but also that Sesortasen III. was equally so; for he also is declared by inscriptions in Nubia to have won victories there in the 6th and 8th years of his reign; and centuries later he was worshipped there as a local god by his successors of Dyn. XVIII. Further, his names are said to have been found not merely on any statue which may have been appropriated and transported by a later king, like the granite lions of Amenoph III. found at Gebel Barkal (Napata), or the statue of a Sevekhotep, now in the Louvre, said to have been found at Bubastis, but on granite fragments of plinths belonging to the great temple at *Tanis*. And this fact (the sculptures being assumed to be contemporary with the names on them) would seem to indicate that he also, no less than Sesortasen I., had ruled from Nubia to the Delta. But if this be admitted, it follows that the intermediate kings Amenemhe II. and Sesortasen II. were also independent sovereigns of all Egypt; and so we have four or five kings equalling in number of generations but exceeding in years Dyn. XVII of the Chronicle; while yet all these are preceded on the monuments by at least one other king, Papa Maire, who distinctly wears both crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt, and yet cannot be referred to the Tanite Dyn. XVI of the Chronicle. Some similar presumption, but of less weight, might be drawn from inscriptions made late in the reign of Amenemhe III. at Toura, (where his 43rd year is marked,) or in the Sinaitic peninsula, where his 45th has been found, and also from the magnitude of his works, if he was the author of the Nilometer at Semneh, and the builder or finisher of the Labyrinth in the Fayoum. On these last signs we need not dwell, as quarries and mines would be accessible to friends and tributaries; and

in other respects the same that has been said of the vast works of the Memphite pyramid-builders (who also brought granite from Syene and copper from the Sinaitic peninsula) applies here. But conquests in Nubia, and still more the erection or decoration of a temple in Tanis, seem certainly at first sight to imply a sovereignty over all Egypt; and in that case the authority of the Chronicle and its historical series must be given up.

But the Chronicle, as has been remarked before, was obliged in all cases alike to make out a single consecutive series of generations and dynasties, though it may well have happened, and seems to have happened in fact, that at some time or other the two kingdoms of Upper and Lower Egypt were nearly evenly balanced, and neither of them, strictly speaking, exercised sovereignty over the other. Let it be supposed that upon the death of Sesortasen I. the Shepherds reduced Memphis, and that from this same point the Memphite Dyn. XVII of the Chronicle ends, and the 184 years of its anonymous Dyn. XXVII of the Shepherds begin; then, since it is said that the Shepherds "violently took Memphis," while for all the rest of Egypt this is *not* said, but the contrary, that they reduced it, whenever they did reduce it, "in a marvellous manner, easily, and without a blow," we must suppose that in the first instance the remaining kingdom of the Amenemhes and Sesortasens in Upper Egypt continued unattacked, independent, and flourishing, though the Shepherds of the Delta, and the city and dependencies of Memphis, were no longer under them. As for Manetho's assertion that the Shepherds burned the cities and massacred or enslaved all the inhabitants, these embellishments need not here be sifted, as they are put by Manetho himself *after* the subjugation of all Egypt, *Upper* as well as *Lower*; while really they are borrowed from another subjugation made above 300 years later by the Asiatic sun-worshippers. But we might admit without difficulty, if it seemed more in accordance with the monuments, not only that down to the eighth year of Sesortasen III. the kingdom of Upper Egypt continued to be independent, but that it continued independent *throughout*, were it not for the express

testimony of Manetho, who certainly would not exaggerate the depression of the native dynasties, that the Shepherds subjugated not only Lower but also Upper Egypt, making the native rulers their vassals and both countries tributary. The same too is implied by a hieratic MS. already alluded to, certain particulars in which may be brought to bear upon another part of the objection from the monuments still remaining. "At that time," it is said, "there was no king [i. e. no native king] in Egypt, except that Ra-s-kennen ruled in Upper Egypt; and the Shepherd king Apophis [seemingly the second of that name], who held Heliopolis and reigned in Avaris, sent to Ra-s-kennen requiring him to co-operate in building a temple for the god Sutech [a name of Typhon occurring also in composition in earlier Tanite-Memphite names in the list of Eratosthenes, and there rendered in Greek *Ἄπης*] at Avaris. And Ra-s-kennen held a council with his chiefs on this demand;" and their refusal to obey this requisition of the Shepherds seems to have been the commencement of that revolt which put an end to their dominion. Now at Tanis and Avaris the Shepherds had for building temples no stone at all; but for limestone they would need the services of their vassals the kings of Memphis and their viceroys in Heliopolis to send them blocks from the quarries of Toura; and for granite, or alabaster if they wanted it, they would need the services of the kings of Upper Egypt, whether these were only friends or vassals. The requisition addressed to Ra-s-kennen by the last Shepherd is not likely to have been the first of its kind, but implies others to which his predecessors both of Dyn. XI and of Dyn. XII of Africanus, and their Nubian contemporaries of Dyn. XIV of Africanus equally, had submitted from the time that they became subjects. And before that time, since the change was without violence, earlier kings of the Thebaid, such as Sesortasen II. and III., though independent, may well have assisted the Shepherd suzerains of Lower Egypt, no less than the Memphite tributaries of the same Shepherds, in quarrying and transporting granite from the Nubian frontier. Nor is there any thing to show that Sutech, the local God of the Sethroitic Nome, and of the

country on the "Saitic," i. e. Sethroitic arm of the Nile, was of foreign introduction; or that he had already become odious at the commencement of the Shepherd rule over Lower Egypt, or during the reign of the three next successors of Sesortasen I. in Upper Egypt. It is quite possible then that Sesortasen III. may have assisted as a friend and ally the contemporary Shepherds of the Delta, in adding to a temple at Tanis, especially to one founded previously by his own ancestor Sesortasen I.; and that in consequence his name, or the names of other contemporary Nubian kings, should be found on its sculptures. It is to be remembered at the same time that the name of Sesortasen III. *might* occur on sculptures not contemporary, added afterwards by kings of Dyn. XVIII, who would be sure to do all they could to efface the memory of the Shepherds even in the Delta, and would commemorate rather even there such kings of Upper Egypt (of Dyn. XII of Africanus) as had been their contemporaries, whether independent or tributary. Lepsius indeed remarks that he "could not find on the site of Tanis those traces of Dyn. XII which seem from the indications attached to his published engravings to have been copied there by Major Burton;" but on the other hand names of the Sevek-hotep family are said to have been found more recently at Tanis, besides the Colossus in the Louvre thought to have come from Bubastis. This latter, like the Lions of Amenoph III., may have been moved; and M. Brugsch even thinks that he has discovered upon it the name of a place in *Upper* Egypt, whence, in that case, no doubt it was brought.

Admitting one or other, or both, of these explanations, the question still remains, at what time, and in what way which was at once "marvellous, easy, and without violence," did the Shepherds become suzerains over the powerful and flourishing kingdom of Upper Egypt, for such the monuments declare it to have been? Exactly the explanation needed is to be found in the occurrence of the seven years' famine, and its prediction, through Joseph, to the Shepherd-king Apophis: for then all the rest of the Egyptians, after exhausting their own resources and their money, were forced to sell first their cattle, then their lands, and lastly their own

liberties to *that* king whom alone Joseph had instructed, and for whom alone all his provisions had been made. (Gen. xii. 34, 35.) And if so, when "all the neighbouring *countries* had recourse to Joseph," it would by no means follow that any other native dynasty, in any other part of Egypt, was then changed (though all such would necessarily become subject, ἀπ' ἄκρων ὀρίων Αἰγύπτου ἕως τῶν ἄκρων), or that it was reduced to any galling servitude, any more than the immediate population of Lower Egypt, who confessed to their preserver that he deserved his name of Zaphnath Pa-anch, for that he "had saved their lives." On the contrary, as after two years of the famine the whole population had sold not only their lands but themselves as serfs, and the king from that time had to choose between feeding them in idleness or employing them on public works for their bread, it is probable that the tributary kings also, through whom any part of Egypt was governed, would obtain a vast increase of personal power, and a superabundance of disposable labour. And even if the Nubian victory of Sesortasen III., which has been placed above in B.C. 1882, or 1879, eleven years, or eight years before the famine, had been attached to a later date, as it would be, if all Manetho's years were successive, this need not have caused any great difficulty. We might even have imagined that the famine itself, with the knowledge that there had been throughout corn in Egypt, produced a pressure of the tribes from the interior towards the Nubian frontier, which it was an important success to repel. It is true that in the list of Africanus (and no doubt also of the original Manetho), Sesortasen III. is identified with the Sesostris of Herodotus, and has the acts of Rameses II. and III. ascribed to him; whereas in Herodotus it is clearly the immediate successor of Mœris, "before whom none had done anything very great," that is, Sesortasen I. the successor of Papa Maire, who was the great conqueror. And if this seems to any one to forbid the idea that Sesortasen III. became a tributary, it may be replied, that this manifest falsehood is rather a sign that there was in the reign of Sesortasen III. something to be dissembled and written backwards, so as to read in a sense precisely contrary to the

truth, according to the received Egyptian method in such cases. So Sesortasen III. (in spite of a throne-name very like "Concharis") is purged of all suspicion of ignominy; and, on the other hand, public works are distinctly ascribed to this "Sesostris" which the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures ascribe to Joseph. Such are the measuring and dividing of the lands, the introduction of surveys, the making of canals, the mounding-up of cities, and the removal of the people into them, which same thing (together with the enslavement of the people) Manetho ascribes to the tyranny of the Shepherds, and Herodotus to that of the Memphite pyramid-builders, contemporaries of the Shepherds, and ruled by a Typhonian influence. Lastly, the importance attached to the earliest ascertainment of the probable rise of the Nile, and the institution of a regular gauge or Nilometer at Semneh in Nubia, seems to hint at something which already, not very long before the reign of Amenemhe III., had drawn great attention to this subject.

It does not appear, then, that there was any real difficulty in placing those dynasties which were known to have existed, and which were named by Manetho, a number of them being distinctly named from separate localities, while the designations of others from the capitals of the two countries as Memphite and Diospolite admit of two senses, one narrower, for strictly local lines, and another wider, for lines connected with Memphis or Thebes only by origin, by occasional not permanent residence, and by general sovereignty. Eratosthenes must have been overpersuaded not because the Theban priests proved to him that the dynasties enumerated *could* not have co-existed within the limits marked by the Chronicle, but because they asseverated, on their own knowledge of their national history and monuments, that they *had not* so co-existed, in fact. The result was a compromise, and the composition of a scheme neither that of the Chronicle nor that of Manetho, yet going far enough towards that of the Chronicle to show what would have been the outline, if Eratosthenes had insisted on a perfect agreement with it; and adding collateral indications besides; whereas, had he insisted on the priests confining themselves

for the first ten dynasties of kings to the 477 years of the Chronicle, and exhibiting only one continuous series, we might have had no indications whatever except of those Dynasties I, III, VI, and XII of Africanus, out of which the series would have been collected. And this reveals precisely what was that difficulty which made the priests declare such a scheme to be impossible. For omitting (which was a thing of course) the Shepherds, they would have had to omit also *either* the pyramid-builders of Memphis, which was impossible as regarded the Greeks, *or* their own later Sesortasens and Amenemhes of Dynasty XII of Africanus, Sesortasen III. the deified organiser of Nubia, and the builders of the Labyrinth and the pyramids of the Fayoum; but this again was quite impossible for their own Theban patriotism, and scarcely more admissible than the omission of the Memphite pyramid-builders, even as regarded the Greeks.

Before leaving this subject of the earlier contemporary dynasties, there are still two points connected with Manetho's exhibition of them which require attention. It has been seen that he has swelled the average length of the reigns in his six dynasties of Lower Egypt from $24\frac{1}{2}$ to $31\frac{1}{2}$, or over 30 years. This, if the rest were equally expanded, or even had the full ordinary average, would hint that his historical materials were insufficient for the space which he had, for cyclical or other reasons, predetermined to fill. But when three dynasties of Upper Egypt follow, all curtailed in their average, and two of them much more curtailed than the six dynasties of Lower Egypt had been lengthened (two or three distinct lines being in one of them blended together, and a whole line found on one of the monuments of Upper Egypt—the Abydos tablet—being perhaps unnoticed), it is clear that it was not from want of materials that he amplified the dynasties of Lower Egypt, but merely from partiality to his own country; while the excessive compression of the kings of Upper Egypt (expanded again, in spite of limited space, in the Theban lists of Eratosthenes), shows not only a partiality contrary to that which sculptured the Karnak Chamber, or wrote the Turin

MS., but also an absolute superabundance of historical materials to be compressed within some predetermined limits. But hence two questions arise: first, if Manetho thus showed a wanton partiality to Lower Egypt, how can he have removed Menes himself, the founder of the monarchy, with two whole dynasties of his descendants, from Tanis, where they are placed by the Chronicle, to connect them with the unimportant city of This, "Teni," in Upper Egypt? And, secondly, if it has been rightly said above that Manetho had no cyclical scheme, what was there to prevent his exhibiting all those lines of Upper and Lower Egypt which had ever existed with at least its full sum of historical years to each, even though he might patriotically honour the kings of Lower Egypt by exaggerating a little the average length of their reigns?

In answer to the first question, it may be said that probably the original Manetho did *not* name Menes *Thinite* at all, but named his first two dynasties of kings simply *Tanite*, "*Τανιτῶν*," like the Chronicle; or perhaps with some slight difference, of which traces may remain in the *Θενίτης*, *Θεινίτης*, *Θεεινίτης*, of the MSS.; while the present reading of the Manetho of Africanus is probably derived from the list of Eratosthenes. This list, being made out by the priests of Upper Egypt, is called "a Theban list," and a list of "Theban kings" distinguished by Syncellus from "Egyptian." By a corruption analogous to that which changed *Τανίτης* into *Θενίτης*, but going a step further, *Θινίτης* itself in the list of Eratosthenes becomes *Θηβινίτης*, and approaches to "Theban." But the first step was probably this:—Menes, the founder of the whole monarchy, appeared and still appears (as at the Ramesseum at Thebes) at the head of the monumental and hieratic lists of *Upper* as well as *Lower* Egypt. Thus he was both a Theban and the head of all later Theban kings; and since one of the fullest and most remarkable of these monumental lists (for the series of the Thothmes Chamber of Karnak began only from the first *Memphite* dynasty) was that of the Temple of Osiris in the sacred city of Abydos, and the priests who worked for Eratosthenes would have this no less than the Karnak Chamber

in their minds, and This, "Teni," though a place of no importance in itself, was the civil capital of the Nome containing Abydos, Menes, through the temple and tomb of Osiris, belonged in some sense also to This, "Teni;" and the similarity of the two words in Greek suggested the idea of transferring him with two whole dynasties, also found with him at Abydos, to Upper Egypt, and naming them all not Tanites, but Thinites. Ptolemy of Mendes, being as much Greek as Egyptian, and living under the Romans when Alexandria had an undisputed pre-eminence, may, even as a Mendesian, have been as ready for the sake of Osiris to honour Abydos as Tanis; and so he may have followed Eratosthenes, whose Egyptian Chronicle he doubtless had before him when he undertook to compile his own re-edition of Manetho on a broader basis.

As regards the second question, though Manetho had no *cyclical* scheme, and even purposely avoided falling into one (perhaps because there were then Greeks at court who understood what the cycle was, or for some other reason), he by no means went to work without any scheme at all; but having gone down parallel with the Chronicle to the end of 2922 + 217 real years from the Creation, and having given the last 239 of these (22 + 217) to kings, and wishing still to place more kings before coming to the 1881 real years still to be numbered from the true date of Menes to the death or flight of Nectanebo II., he found in the 40 and in the 443 years "of the Cycle," that is, of the real current Cycle, thrown back by the Chronicle, a precedent for throwing back or reduplicating as many years "of the Cycle," past or future, as he pleased. That he stopped exactly where he did, when he was short by 26 of having either reduplicated or anticipated and thrown back *all* the 1461 years of the current Cycle, has been explained already by the supposition that he purposely avoided everything of a cyclical form, and that he desired to mark his date for Alexander at B.C. 331, in the same way in which the Chronicle had marked its own epoch of B.C. 305; while if he had gone beyond "the Cycle," that is, the true current Cycle, the only one he alluded to, in throwing back and anticipating years, he would have gone beyond the ut-

most expansion of that earlier scheme which he was following, even while varying from it in details, and would have been introducing fictitious years of arbitrary fabrication unconnected even by analogy with former precedents, and borrowed from future cycles, which had not as yet, like the Cycle current, even an inchoate existence, or a name by which they could be designated.

From the head of Dyn. XVIII downwards, we have at length only one consecutive series in the lists of Manetho, to compare with that of the Chronicle. On coming to this point Manetho has already paralleled three years more of the 1881 of the kings of the Chronicle than the 477 composing its Dynasties XVI, XVII, and XXVII. Consequently the head of Dyn. XVIII does not seem to coincide exactly in the two schemes, but according to the *apparent* chronology of Manetho it is depressed to B.C. 1745, instead of standing at B.C. 1748. But this difference need not occupy us, for we shall soon see that Manetho in the details of his lists (no less than in his narrative) is regardless of true chronology, though he compensates omissions purposely made at certain points of history by corresponding insertions of unchronological years in other places; so that the true chronology is represented in its general outline, and hinted even as regards details, at least to the initiated. So then, neglecting Manetho's depression of the head of Dyn. XVIII to B.C. 1745 as only apparent, we understand from it only that we have already 3 years in hand to go towards filling up the first void which may occur below; or rather, to speak more exactly, we have 2 years and 10 months, since Dyn. XVII (XV of Africanus), as restored from Josephus, was 2 months short of 260 full years. But in point of true chronology Manetho's two Diospolite Dynasties XVIII and XIX of $333 + 209 = 542$ years, are identical and ought to be coincident with Dynasties XVIII and XIX of the Chronicle, (though XVIII is by it called Memphite,) with $348 + 194 = 542$ years; these 542 years beginning from B.C. 1748, and ending in B.C. 1206. The Diospolite Dyn. XX of the Chronicle, again, is for 135 years of its 228 chronologically identical with Dyn. XX of Manetho, from B.C. 1206 to B.C. 1071. Its remaining 93 years

Union of all
Egypt, from
B.C. 1748
downwards.

(reaching chronologically to B.C. 978) are transferred by Manetho to Tanites of Lower Egypt, for whom he creates a new dynasty of his own, his Dyn. XXI, raising the sum of its years from 93 to 130 by the help of 37 unchronological years brought up from times far below. Irrespectively of its apparent undue depression by $(2.10^m. + 37 =)$ 39 years and 10 months (as if to B.C. 938), his Bubastite Dyn. XXII is commensurate within one year and identical with the Tanite Dyn. XXI of the Chronicle, a dynasty which has 121 years, from B.C. 978 to B.C. 857. Dyn. XXIII of Manetho, also Tanite, supplies in its 89 years both 1 year lacking to his preceding Dynasty XXII, and 48 (reaching chronologically to B.C. 809) to match the 48 of the Tanite Dyn. XXII of the Chronicle, and 19 (reaching to B.C. 790) to match the 19 of its Dynasty XXIII (which though called Diospolite is identifiable with the two reigns and 18 years of Osorchon and Psammis in Dyn. XXIII of Manetho); and lastly, it contains 21 years besides, reaching on to B.C. 769, and telling towards the 44 of the Saite Dyn. XXIV of the Chronicle. This is identical with Manetho's own Dyn. XXIV, to which however, as being ignominious, he allows only one king, Bocchoris, and instead of 44 only 6 years. So at their end (in B.C. 763) he would be still short of the end of the same dynasty in the Chronicle by 17 years, had he not created above an undue depression to the amount of 40 years, or, as we must reckon, of 39 years and 10 months. But the deficit now found at the end of his Dyn. XXIV absorbing only 17 of these surplus-years, his Ethiopian Dyn. XXV, which is identical with Dyn. XXV of the Chronicle, and nearly commensurate, having 40 only instead of 44 years, begins, according to the *apparent* chronology of Manetho, nearly 23 years lower than according to the chronology of the Chronicle (in B.C. 723 instead of 746), and ends nearly 19 years later than according to the chronology of the Chronicle, viz. in B.C. 683 instead of 702. So that under the dislocated chronology of Manetho it may perhaps be implied that the whole period of Ethiopian rule lasted as long as $(44 + 19 =)$ 63 years from the first conquest of Egypt by Sabaco to the death of Tirhakah. So then beginning his

Saite Dyn. XXVI, identical with the Memphitico-Saite XXVI of the Chronicle, at B.C. 683, he needs for it only 158 years, instead of 177, to make it end in B.C. 525, coincidently with the end of the 177 years which the same Dyn. XXVI has in the Chronicle. But in point of fact he gives it only 150 years and 6 months according to the lists of Africanus, the remaining 7 years and 6 months, being represented by 4 months added to the 124 years of the Persian Dyn. XXVII, with 6 years (really only concurrent) of Amyrtæus constituting Dyn. XXVIII (unknown to the Chronicle), and 1 year and 4 months added by the lists of Africanus in Dyn. XXIX to those 57 years which Dyn. XXIX and XXX together should contain according to the Chronicle. Of these additions, making in all 7 years and 8 months, 2 months may be regarded as the complement due to that fraction of 10 months in Dyn. XVII of Manetho (XV of Africanus) which has been noticed above, but which has since, for convenience, been neglected in our reckonings. The remaining 7 years and 6 months fill up what is lacking on Dyn. XXVI; but they do so only by thrusting up, according to the *apparent* chronology of Manetho, the beginning of his Dyn. XXVII of Persians from Jan. B.C. 525, where it is put by the Chronicle, to May of B.C. 533, nearly 4 years before the death of Cyrus. But it is said expressly in the heading of Dyn. XXIII of Ptolemy of Mendes and Africanus (and the specification was no doubt copied from the original Manetho), that Cambyzes "reduced Egypt in his *fifth* Persian year," which certainly began in Jan. B.C. 525. We see then in what light years interpolated by Manetho (whether above or below his chief suppressions on Dynasties XXIV, XXV, and XXVI) are to be regarded. They are to be regarded in the places where they occur as mere compensations, notes of restorations to be made elsewhere by such as understand the true succession and course of the history. And thus much having been said of the general chronology, we may now consider each one of Manetho's later dynasties by itself.

It is certain that Dyn. XVIII of Manetho, which expelled the Shepherds, is one with Dyn. XVIII of the Chronicle: yet there is a remarkable difference in its designation,

Dyn. XVIII.
xvi. Dynast.
Iltes. Nov. 4,
B.C. 1748, to
Aug. 9, B.C.
1400.

Manetho naming it "Diospolite," but the Chronicle a little earlier "Memphite;" whence in the scheme of Eratosthenes it is feigned *not* to be coincident with Dyn. XVIII of Manetho, but to contain other earlier kings half Memphite by origin, just as the kings of Dyn. XVIII of Manetho were by connection half Nubian. But earlier still, when Herodotus first visited Egypt, the Memphite priests, far from claiming those kings as Memphites, ignored their whole dynasty as Ethiopian. For they told him that in the whole course of their history there had been XVIII Ethiopian kings, and one queen: — Herodotus says, "one queen, a native Egyptian woman," and identifies her with Nitocris: but this was perhaps only his own addition; as there were certainly more queens than one, and his informants probably meant the queen Hatasu (included under the name Amensis or Amesses in Manetho), sister of Thothmes III. Subtracting from the XVIII the III Ethiopian kings of Dyn. XXV. who were too well known to be omitted, there remain xv kings and one queen suiting well the lists of Manetho and the monuments for Dyn. XVIII, and for no other. And no doubt the kings of that dynasty all reigned over Nubia as well as Egypt, and its founder was connected by origin and intermarriage with Nubian and even with *black* Nubian blood. This Nubian connection of the dynasty explains in some degree, as has been said above, the great development given on the right side of the Karnak Chamber, and still more in the Turin papyrus, and in Dynasties XIII and XIV of Africanus, to the genealogy of the Nubian kings derived from Amenemhe I. It explains also the widespread notion of later times that the monarchy, civilisation, and religion of Egypt had descended the valley of the Nile from Ethiopia, that is from Nubia, to Thebes. The same idea, in a form near to the truth, is expressed by Manetho when he represents the native kings (whether the chronology be exact or mythical matters little) flying from Asiatic strangers into Ethiopia, abiding there for a time, and thence redescending to expel the Shepherds, as by an avenging whirlwind, in the compound persons of the Sethoses and Rameseses. That Dyn. XVIII was most properly called Diospolite the ruins of Thebes, which it first raised to greatness, sufficiently attest:

and they prove further the connection of its kings not only with the Nubians of Dyn. XVI of Manetho (XIV of Africanus), but also with the older local Diospolite line of Dyn. XI, and the Memphite-Diospolite line of XII of Africanus. But to explain fully the designation "Memphite" given it in the Chronicle, we must remember that Memphis had long been the chief capital of the district, "country," and older kingdom or empire of Lower Egypt; and that this kingdom, *never destroyed by the Shepherds*, was obtained a little before their expulsion, and before the capture of Avaris, by Amosis the founder of Dyn. XVIII, not by conquest, like the eastern Delta, but probably by marriage with an heiress; so that Memphis under the kings of Dyn. XVIII preserved its honour as the elder of two co-ordinate capitals. The two crowns, the white and the red, were worn separate or united at will; and there was a close union of the Upper and Lower kingdoms, without either one being incorporated into the other. The ruins too of Memphis, where the Colossus of Rameses II., the Sesostris of Herodotus, is still seen, the relation of Herodotus concerning the propylæa about the temple of Phtha erected by his successors, and a number of recent discoveries and inscriptions, show that great works were executed there too by the kings of Dyn. XVIII, the eldest son of the king, the heir-apparent to both crowns, being sometimes the local viceroy. So Artapanus, a writer of no great weight, certainly, but one whose stories must have had some source, and who was quoted in the time of Augustus by Chæremon in a passage already alluded to, only reverses perhaps the truth when he makes the king who expelled the Shepherds, "Ph-Almanoth" (a name more like Amenoph than Amoses), to have been properly "king of Memphis, and to have given his daughter Μέρρις (for he had no son) in marriage to Chenephres, the Χέβρων seemingly of Manetho, who reigned in the parts *above* Memphis, (βασιλεύοντι τῶν ὑπὲρ Μέμφιν τόπων), there being then a number of kings at once in Egypt." But in truth it was the king of Upper Egypt, Amosis, who expelled the Shepherds, and he perhaps married a surviving daughter and heiress of Ph-Almnphtis, or Thamphthis, the last king of Memphis of Dyn. IV, or gave his own daughter to a son-in-law named Χέβρων,

or *Xerappis*, a collateral of Upper Egypt. For the name "*Merit*," in composition, is borne on the monuments by a sister of Amenoph, daughter of Amosis. So it was possible for a native of Lower Egypt, if only a little partial to his own region, to view the kings of Dyn. XVIII as Memphites, they being the legitimate heirs of the elder kingdom, though no doubt more immediately connected by blood, in the male line at least, with Upper Egypt and Nubia; and though they made their general residence (eventually at least) in the upper capital. In the time of Manetho, Alexandria having long eclipsed all the older capitals, Lower Egypt could better afford to give Thebes its due, and to name from it this line of great kings who plainly made it their chief city, and whose tombs were known to be there. But in the time of Herodotus, just after the re-establishment of the Persian dominion, the two rival countries and capitals had nothing left but to make the most of past glories. And Thebes having had a long succession of great dynasties, against which Memphis had little to set except Moëris, and a share in the compound personage of Sesostriis, and the pyramids, a keen jealousy emboldened the Memphite priests, in conversing through interpreters with a Greek who might never visit Thebes (and in fact did not visit it until long after, too late to add more than a note or two to his earlier work), to be silent about the wonders of Thebes, and even indirectly to ignore and stigmatise its chief dynasty, Dyn. XVIII, as Ethiopian.

With regard to the true chronological place and construction of Dynasties XVIII and XIX, it has been seen above, in a passage extracted by Josephus from Manetho's Third Book, that Manetho acknowledged 13 years of servitude to Asiatic strangers, while a king named Amenoph, whose reign in Egypt was followed by their invasion, was surviving as an exile in Ethiopia, till his son Sethos "also called Rameses" was old enough to return with him and expel them. Josephus could not see distinctly where this king Amenoph, or the 13 years of his exile, were placed, but supposed them to be intended to follow *after* Sethos son of Amenoph and head of Dyn. XIX in the lists, and his two successors Rapsakes and

Amenephtes; "for Rameses-Sethos" himself being identified elsewhere with Ægyptus, in whose eighth year Danaus fled to Greece, this seemed to put *him* out of the question. But at any rate the story was clearly connected by Manetho with Dyn. XIX. But the lists, as ascertained through the help of Josephus, reveal the fact that not 13 exactly, but 15 years, have been suppressed by Manetho out of the 348 belonging to Dyn. XVIII, and have been transferred to Dyn. XIX. And assuming that his Egyptian names and reigns are trustworthy and historical, the question is, to what part of Dyn. XVIII do the 15 years so suppressed and transposed chronologically belong? Where are we to detect the intervention of a time of disgrace and servitude under impious Asiatics, whose memory was odious, like that of the Shepherds and the Hebrews, and whose names have been suppressed? The monuments enable us to answer this question with something like certainty; for they prove that between the reigns of Amenoph III. (the Memnon of the Greeks), the eighth king of the dynasty (the same name too as in Manetho), and of Horus, seemingly his son, there really intervened a king who worshipped not the gods of Egypt, but mutilated their effigies, and worshipped only the solar disk. Women and others come out to implore his clemency as to a conqueror: the native Egyptians crouch before him as in fear: Asiatics, with beards and hooked noses, are in his suite: and lastly, this king and the other members of his family are distinguished by a peculiar malformation, a thickness about the loins and hips, precisely similar to that of certain figurines in earthenware found in Mesopotamia. Several of these, which are in the British Museum, will enable any one who pleases to make the comparison for himself. This sun-worshipping king, with one or two others, one of them a local "king of Thebes," named Ai, who appears in his suite, and who reigned with him or after him, certainly intervened between Amenoph III. and Horus; for they have defaced the monuments and the tomb, and have appropriated the cartouches of Amenoph III., while Horus has in like manner defaced their monuments, and cut in his names over theirs. Their dominion certainly lasted for some years, one would think at least fifteen, to

judge from the number of their monuments still remaining, and the size and magnificence of some tombs (at Tel-el-Amarna),—which however, being incomplete, hint its sudden termination. And though they thus certainly existed, their names are uniformly omitted from all the later monumental lists, as those of the Ramensseum and Medinet Habou, and of the Abydos tablet, and probably also from the written list of Manetho in Josephus; though it is true that some make them to be the source of the name Achencheres in the last-named list. The reader therefore will judge (apart from all minor questions of detail) how far it is probable or certain that we have found both the true place of the 15 years suppressed or transposed by Manetho, and also the cause of their transposition. The next step is to read his myth afresh, and to distinguish in it those historical elements which either clearly suit the monumental indications for the interval between Amenoph III. and Horus, or are not inconsistent with them. Now according to Manetho there was an invasion: the invaders were Asiatics, Shasou, akin to the earlier Shepherds. Like them they were impious towards the gods of Egypt, doing violences from which the earlier Shepherds had abstained. The time of their invasion was not only after the expulsion of the earlier Shepherd kings, but after the Hebrew shepherds had settled in Palestine: and when they entered Egypt they came themselves from or through Palestine, of which therefore it seems, of the coast at any rate, they were already masters. As for the advance of Amenoph to meet them, and his religious scruple, which made him to return to Memphis without fighting, and retire thence to Ethiopia, this probably is an allusion to the march of another Amenoph (Amenoph II.) after the Hebrews, whom he overtook at the Red Sea, and returned "without a battle." But Amenoph III., to judge from the indications of the monuments, was already dead, and buried in the tomb which he had prepared for himself (the tomb was afterwards defaced and his palace destroyed), when the sun-worshippers became dominant in Egypt; and we may conjecture that they came in at first "without a battle," having some claim to the succession, for Taia, queen of Amenoph III., seems to have been of their

lineage; and there is in the Vatican a scarabæus of his 11th year, on which she is represented together with her husband as worshipping the sun's disk. Or else, if some son of Amenoph III. disputed their entrance, he was defeated; and he may have fled to Ethiopia. The atrocities of setting fire to cities, and roasting and eating Apis, if not pure fables borrowed from the Persian Ochus, (which there is no sufficient reason to assert,) agree with the express assertion of a conquest, and not with any mere internal change or succession. Lastly, the survival of Amenoph III. to return with his son merely to see poetical justice satisfied, and then die, and the identification of the son with Sethos I. and II. and with Rameses II. and III., all blended into one person, is of course mythical. Yet even this is to a certain extent illustrated by the monuments, which show that the first military exploits of Seti I. and his son Rameses II. were in fact performed in warring against the Shasou, i. e. the Arabian or other Shepherds, who, though no longer lords of Egypt, were still formidable beyond the frontier; and it was after these had been overcome that their wars extended to the Khita and the Rotennou, apparently the Hittites and the Chaldæans. It was probably the fact that the word *Shasou* designated at once the elder Shepherd kings, the Hebrew shepherds, and all Arabs and other Asiatic nomads, that suggested to Manetho the idea of blending four distinct histories into one myth, which for its complete inversion of the truth and the proportions and complexity of its falsehoods is certainly remarkable.

That account of the 15 years suppressed by Manetho in the middle of Dyn. XVIII, which has been obtained by the comparison of his lists and narrative with the Chronicle and with the monuments, may be further illustrated from sacred history. For according to the joint scale of the Scriptures and Josephus and of the Chronicle the reign of Amenoph III. seems to end at June 22 B.C. 1588, in the year after that in which Joshua died; and nine years later, in B.C. 1579, the Hebrews were subjugated by a king named in the Hebrew text Chushan Rishathaim, in the LXX. Χουσαν-σ-αθαϊμ, in Josephus Χουσαρθης, variations which show the proper name

to be Chousan, Chousar, Choushan, or Choushar, the syllable Ri or Ri-*s* to be omissible, and Sathaim or *s*-Athaim to be an adjunct. And this king is called "king of the Arabs," those of Irak perhaps, towards the mouth of the Euphrates, (who would be named Shasou by the old Egyptians, and would be likely enough to be sun-worshippers,) "and of the Mesopotamians," the malformation of whose figurines has been noticed above. (Sennacherib, it may be remarked in passing, is in like manner called king of the Arabians in the second book of Herodotus.) But in all ages a conqueror taking possession of Judæa from the north would be on his way to Egypt; or if he had swept down the coast and conquered Egypt first, he would not think his possession of it secure till he had also reduced the hill country of Palestine. On the other hand, if he suffered reverses in Palestine, he would have to evacuate Egypt; or, if he first lost Egypt, Syria also would be emboldened to rebel. But according to our scale, Chushan being defeated by Othniel, the Hebrews, after a servitude of 8 years, regained their independence in B.C. 1571, two years after Egypt, according to Manetho harmonised with the Chronicle, had thrown off the yoke of the sun-worshippers. For so the accession of Horus is put at June 18, B.C. 1573. But according to Manetho's own lists, as they stand, with the head of Dyn. XVIII apparently depressed by 3 years, the independence of Egypt would be recovered only in 1570, in the next year after the victories of Othniel. And apart from this, as Manetho has been detected already in his narrative cutting off two years from the sun-worshippers, writing 13 instead of 15, though his own lists when examined reveal the error, it is likely enough that these two years are not all that he has suppressed; and that for their recovery of independence the Egyptians were in fact indebted to the victories of Othniel. Even the monumental name of the sun-worshipping king in Egypt and that of the Arabian or Mesopotamian in the Bible seem to be only variations, analogous to those of other names admitted to be the same. And the Egyptians in writing hieroglyphically foreign names were used to naturalise them in a manner, so that the sounds expressed and the

emblems employed to express them should bear an Egyptian sense. The position of the name proper and the adjunct in the hieroglyphical name Athin-Ra-Quashan is like that of other names with their adjuncts, as "Amon-meri [or Mi] Rameses," "Amon-mi-Shishonk," which in Greek become Rameses-Miammous and Shishonk-Miammous. So too we should read Athin-Ra or Ra-Athin-Quashan. The fact that the syllable Ra in the hieroglyphical name is only a determinative accounts for the variations of the Greek and the Hebrew, as if it were all one to write Choushan *Ri-s*-bathaim or Choushan-Sathaim. The final syllable *in* looking like the Chaldee plural, it is natural to find it in the Hebrew *aim*. The *s* or *sh* in the middle of the name, as written in Hebrew, may be merely euphonic, to divide the two open vowels. As regards the *s* or *sh* (permutable in Egyptian with *kh*) in the proper name itself, it certainly seems to be wanting when the name is read "Khouen"; but if the name Sa-*hou*-ra is found written in Greek Asaouchis, it is not impossible that Khou'-en also might become Chouchan or Choushan. Bunsen and Lepsius themselves tell us that the hieroglyphic group, which in this name they agree to read "Khou," is proved by a Greek rendering, "οὐσετε," to have had sometimes the sound of "Ouash" or "Quash," which will justify us perhaps in writing the name Quashan. And if in the Hebrew the determinative Ra or Re precedes instead of following the word Athin which it determines, this impropriety is more than balanced by our finding the same syllable 'Pη treated in the Greek as a superfluity, and omitted altogether, Χουσαρ-σ-αθατμ being the LXX. rendering of the Chushan-ri-sh-athaim of the Hebrew text. At any rate, having an Arabian and Mesopotamian conqueror, with a name so nearly alike, in Palestine *at the very time*, we can scarcely avoid identifying him with the sun-worshipper of the Egyptian monuments; especially as these Shasou are made by Manetho to come from Judæa, and at the invitation of those other Shepherds (not really identical with the Hebrews), who according to him "are sometimes called Arabs," and who had long before been expelled from Egypt. If this identification be ultimately established, it will be the oldest of all known synchronisms

of sacred and profane records. And hence light may be thrown on several expressions of Manetho; as, for instance, when Amenoph the son of Pepi predicts that there should come *σύμμαχοι*, allies, to take the part of the lepers, i. e. of the Hebrews oppressed by the kings of Dyn. XVIII. For though the Hebrews were no longer in Egypt to be assisted, and the Arabs of Chushan were not exactly their allies, yet they being themselves subjects and *so* allies of the Arabians, the invasion which came through and from their country came in a manner from them; and individuals of them may even have attended Chushan into Egypt. And when Manetho says that the whole time of the Shepherds in Egypt from first to last was 511 years, if we remember how Avaris (Heberland), the residence probably of Abram himself, had been "Typhonian from the beginning," the Egyptians having already in Abram's time been plagued there for his sake, it may be that the 511 years are reckoned from those first plagues of the time of Abram to the expulsion of the Arabian "Hierosolymites," the sun-worshippers, whose irruption from the side of Palestine was the fourth and last inroad of Shasou. For the call of Abram being in B.C. 2084, and Abram going down into Egypt shortly after, the 511 years if reckoned from that descent would end within a year or two after B.C. 1573. The only other point from which one might expect the 511 years to be reckoned is from the commencement of the Shepherd Dyn. XVII of Manetho (XV of Africanus). But so they would end not with any Amenoph, or Sethos, or Rameses, but in the 7th year of Achencheres, the 13th king of Dyn. XVIII, supposing the 15 years of the sun-worshippers to have been inserted between the reigns of Amenoph III. and Horus.

Not having before us the actual reigns of the kings of Dynasties XVI, XVII, XXVII, and XVIII of the Chronicle, with their years, months, and days, we cannot tell what fractions at the end of Dyn. XXVII and again of Dyn. XVIII may have been cut off by it, and reckoned to the following dynasties XVIII and XIX, when it made Dyn. XVIII, after 477 full years from Menes, begin from November 4 (then Thoth 1, of the movable year) in B.C.

1748, and end with the last day of the movable year in B.C. 1400; nor, consequently, from what day the *actual* reign of Amosis began, it being perhaps antedated somewhat when put technically at Nov. 4, B.C. 1748. For though the years and fractions given by Josephus from Manetho for the reigns of Dyn. XVIII happen to join together into exactly 333 years, needing 15 full years more to equal the 348 of Dyn. XVIII in the Chronicle, it is not to be thought that the actual accession of Amosis was on the Egyptian new year, Nov. 4; that the sun-worshippers again held Egypt for exactly 15 years from June 22 (not then near to the new year), B.C. 1588 to June 18, B.C. 1573; and again that the last king of the dynasty, Amenoph, ended his reign of 19 years and six months exactly on the eve of the new year, or within a fortnight of it (since Manetho did not exhibit fractional *days*, but rounded them off to months), in B.C. 1400. The Egyptians, as a general rule, did not fill up fractions remaining over, but cut them off, and antedated the following reign or dynasty so as to include them. Consequently, if Manetho and the author of the Chronicle both reckoned the actual reign of Amosis to begin from the same point, and gave it from that point Manetho's length of 25 years and about 4 months, it would have probably in *addition* in the Chronicle when antedated technically from Nov. 4, B.C. 1748, some fraction remaining over from the sum of the *actual* reigns of the three earlier dynasties. Whether the Chronicle and Manetho did in fact both alike reckon the actual reign of Amosis with 25 years and 4 months from one and the same point, is another question. The Chronicle probably made his actual reign, as head of a sovereign dynasty, begin not from his first Theban accession but from his coronation at Memphis, which according to the monuments (see the "Tomb of Aahmes," illustrated by De Rougé) was a year later, and which in that case (the season for war for that year being over) must have been either on or after Nov. 4 of B.C. 1748, and if after, not long after, since the inundation was then over, and the season for opening the next campaign was already approaching. And Manetho is understood by Josephus to reckon the 25 years and 4 months of the actual

reign of Amosis not only like the Chronicle from an accession in Lower rather than Upper Egypt, but from the "expulsion of the Shepherds;" that is, from the capture of Avaris, which according to the monuments was several years later, seemingly in his *fifth* year: for Josephus writes thus: — "Μετὰ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τὸν λαὸν τῶν ποιμένων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ὁ ἐκβαλὼν αὐτοὺς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου βασιλεὺς Τέθμωσις ἐβασίλευσε μετὰ ταῦτα ἔτη εἴκοσι πέντε καὶ μῆνας τέσσαρας, καὶ ἐτελεύτησε." But Manetho, if the words *μετὰ ταῦτα* are from him, is not here writing history properly so called, but fable in all but the list of reigns itself; and even that he introduces with a mythical name for its first king. And in a precisely parallel case, where he introduces the first king of Dyn. XIX, Sethos II., mythically blended with others, and named Rameses, he says that "*after* expelling his brother Danaus he reigned 59 years," whereas his own lists, containing at that place no separate reign of 8 years, nor any brother Danaus at all, show plainly that the 8 years in question, if any one is so scrupulous as to inquire after them, are identical with the first 8 years of Sethos II. himself, while, as Rameses, he is pursuing his foreign and mythical conquests. And so Josephus too reckons, when, casting up the whole 59 years of this Sethos-Rameses, he says that "from the Exodus of the Shepherds to the flight of Danaus were 393 years." So no weight is to be attached to the words "*μετὰ ταῦτα*," and the like, in the case of Amosis, whose reign of 25 years and 4 months was most likely taken by Manetho from some hieratic MS. giving it from his original Theban accession, and not, like the Chronicle, from his coronation at Memphis, still less from the "expulsion of the Shepherds." In that case the date for the death of Amosis, and all the dates following down to the death or the fabulous expulsion of Amenoph III. inclusively, when reduced to the scale of the Chronicle, will be earlier by one full antedated year *at least* than they would seem to be if Manetho's actual reign of 25 years and 4 months were to be reckoned from the coronation at Memphis, or from the first of Thoth a little preceding.

But as the precise date of the coronation at Memphis, and

the length of the actual reign of Amosis reckoned from that date by the Chronicle and increased somewhat (unless it were celebrated purposely on the new year) by antedating from Thoth 1, and the date of the actual Theban accession preceding, from which alone, as we suppose, Amosis reigned 25 years and 4 months, are unknown,—we shall draw out first, but only provisionally, the chronology of the dynasty as it would seem to follow from the written lists if its *actual* commencement in Manetho's lists and its technical commencement in the Chronicle were both alike from Thoth 1, = Nov. 4 in B.C. 1748. Then,

1. *Tethmosis*, "after expelling the Shepherds," would reign from Thoth 1 = Nov. 4, B.C. 1748, 25 years and 4 months to Feb. 26, B.C. 1722.

2. *Chebron*, would reign 13 years, from Feb. 26, B.C. 1722, to Feb. 22, B.C. 1709.

3. *Amenoph I.*, 20 years, 7 months, from Feb. 22, B.C. 1709, to Sept. 15, B.C. 1689. And his death seems to be 5 years after the flight of Moses from Egypt, Moses having been born in the 13th of Amosis.

4. *Amessis*, his sister, 21 years, 9 months, from Sept. 15, B.C. 1689, to June 12, B.C. 1667 (or, according to a various reading given by Theophilus of Antioch, as if from Josephus, 21 years, 1 month, from Sept. 15, B.C. 1689, to Oct. 15, B.C. 1668).

5. *Mephres*, 12 years, 9 months, from June 12, B.C. 1667, to March 11, 1654, his death seeming to approach within a month of the Exodus; March 11 of anticipated Julian reckoning, but without the Gregorian correction, being in B.C. 1654 equal, or nearly, to March 29 of true reckoning, 18 days later. (But with the reading of Theophilus mentioned above Mephres would reign from Oct. 15, B.C. 1668, to July 8, 1655, and die in the year before the Exodus; and then all the following dates would be 8 months earlier.)

6. *Mephramouthosis*, 25 years, 10 months, from March 11, B.C. 1654, to Jan. 3, B.C. 1628. (Theophilus gives a variant of only 20 years and 10 months.)

7. *Thmosis* is said to have reigned 9 years and 8 months, from Dec. 25, B.C. 1629, to Aug. 29, B.C. 1619.

8. *Amenoph*, 30 years, 10 months, from Aug. 29, B.C. 1619, to June 22, 1588. (In his 5th, B.C. 1614, on the death of *Moses*, the Hebrews under *Joshua* would enter Canaan, and in the spring of 1589 *Joshua* died.) Here would follow

[A void of exactly 15 years, thrown down to Dyn. XIX, but really needed between *Amenoph III.* and *Horus*; that is, seemingly, between June 22, B.C. 1588 and June 18 B.C. 1573. In the 9th of these, on the death of all the Elders who outlived *Joshua*, the Hebrews would be subjugated by *Chushan-Rish-Athaim* (*Χουσαρ-σ-αθαίμ, Χουσαρθης, Χουσαχάρ*), and remain in servitude to him 8 years, from B.C. 1579 to 1571.]

9. *Horus*, 36 years, 5 months, from June 18, B.C. 1573 to Nov. 11, B.C. 1537.

10. *Achencheres*, his daughter, 12 years, 1 month, from Nov. 11, B.C. 1537 to Dec. 8, B.C. 1525.

11. *Rathotis*, her brother, 9 years, from Dec. 8, B.C. 1525, to Dec. 6, B.C. 1516.

12. *Achencheres*, 12 years, 5 months, from Dec. 6, B.C. 1516, to May 2, B.C. 1503.

13. Another *Achencheres*, 12 years, 3 months, from May 2, B.C. 1503, to July 27, B.C. 1491.

14. *Armais*, 4 years, 1 month, from July 27, B.C. 1491, to Aug. 31, B.C. 1487.

15. *Ramesses*, 1 year, 4 months, from Aug. 30, B.C. 1487, to Dec. 28, B.C. 1486.

16. *Armesses Miammou*, 66 years, 2 months, from Dec. 28, B.C. 1486, to Feb. 10, B.C. 1419. In his 53rd, B.C. 1433, the Hebrews would be subjugated by *Jabin*, king of Canaan, a connection probably of *Ramesses Miammou*, who, after warring with them, married a princess of the *Khita*.

17. *Amenoph*, 19 years, 6 months, from Feb. 10, B.C. 1419, to the eve of *Thoth 1* = August 9, B.C. 1400. In his 6th the Hebrews would regain their independence through the victories of *Deborah* and *Barak*. *Sisera* sounds like an Egyptian name; and this triumph of the Hebrew shepherds just 13 years before the death of *Amenoph* may possibly have suggested the number 13 instead of 15 for the duration of an earlier disgrace put under another *Amenoph*, and to be followed by the glorious reign of a *Sethos-Ramesses*.

With this general outline of the chronology, bearing in mind the uncertainties noticed above, and the variant of Theophilus for the reign of Amesses, and having already disentangled and placed what relates to the sun-worshipping Shepherds, we may approach the remainder of Manetho's fable, which is still complex, and separate in it what relates only to the Hebrews from what relates to the Shepherds properly so called.

The king who really expelled the Shepherds and founded Dyn. XVIII is nowhere named by Manetho by his true name Amosis. For in Theophilus, though he is quoting from Josephus, and in Syncellus, who writes "*Ἀμωσις ὁ καὶ Τέθμωσις*," this is only a gloss, a fair one indeed in this sense that the Tethmosis of Manetho, as expelling the Shepherds and founding a dynasty, *must* so far be one with Amosis; but quite groundless, if the meaning be that Manetho is writing historically, and that Amosis really bore both names. But so far as the Shepherds are made to blend with the Hebrews, and their expulsion is put down mythically (as a first step) by 93 or 94 years, Alisphragmuthosis or Mispframuthosis (i. e. Thothmes III.) is rightly named as the king who waged the great war with them; that is, *mutatis mutandis*, whose tyranny in the land of Avaris immediately preceded and led to the Exodus. In a tomb of his time at Thebes, in which the making of bricks for the temple of Ammon is represented, the labourers (mixed with native Egyptians of the conventional red colour) are light-coloured bearded Asiatics, having officers of their own, who are seen measuring the daily task, while taskmasters much darker than the red Egyptians, of a purplish or chocolate colour, showing a Nubian connection, stand over them in the attitude of command, or sit by with rods in their hands. And though the scene is at Thebes, that is no reason for doubting of its representing the Hebrews, who being in such numbers in the Delta, and all reduced to this slavery, some of them might well be found also at Thebes; and they are certainly to be first thought of even there, and rather than any other more distant Asiatics. So we see Thothmes even to this day waging his war against the Hebrew

shepherds, who later, no doubt, were all without exception concentrated near Avaris "by condescension of the king Amenoph," as Manetho says, when he was vacillating whether to let them go or not. It was *not* however, according to Manetho, under Mispframuthosis that the [Hebrew] shepherds were actually expelled, but under his son Thouthmosis or Tethmosis; that is, to speak historically, under Amenoph II. the son of Miphra-Thothmosis or Thothmes III. And Manetho himself elsewhere (when the Hebrews already settled in Palestine are to be confused with other Shepherds, Arabs, really their oppressors, and to be made to come down again *in* them to be finally ejected as lepers), having no longer anything to fear from a name now removed to a distant time and belonging to another king, admits that it was the name Amenoph, not Thothmes, to which some humiliation had attached through the lepers and the shepherds of Jerusalem. But in his earlier myth, in which the Hebrews, as such, are not named, the earlier Shepherds being brought down, so as to cover them, to the true time of the Exodus, he shrinks from naming Amenoph II., and makes Mispfragmuthosis supply half of his own compound name as a name for his son: and even this he varies again in the lists, putting in them "Mephres" first as the father, and "Miphrathmuthosis" second as the son, that the two may not be too clearly recognised. The son then of these two it is who besieged the [Hebrew] shepherds within that strong wall with which they had surrounded the whole region of Avaris, the wall being the Divine Power which protected them, and exempted them when it plagued the Egyptians. And despairing at length of reducing them to submission, he consented to their departure; and they went out towards the desert, towards Syria. [From this point the continuation is given by the other myth of the lepers and the Hierosolymites.] And the king Amenoph, whom some even of his own priests had warned that he was fighting against a Typhonian power, marched [after them] and came up with them; but he returned without having joined battle; and [not caring perhaps to be too near to "the field of Zoan"] he went up from Memphis to Thebes,

and there abode; while the lepers and Hierosolymites, under Osarsiph-Moses, i. e. under Joseph and Moses, for the bones of Joseph went up with them, [after an interval of 40 years,] settled in that country of which [600 years later] they made Jerusalem the capital. And thence, under another Amenoph, these Hierosolymite Shepherds, blended with the sun-worshipping Arabs, are called down as his brethren by Joseph-Moses and the lepers (i. e. by themselves, as if they were still in Egypt), to avenge their own wrongs, and to be once more and finally expelled. Some of the expressions put by Manetho into the mouth of Joseph-Moses, the priest of Heliopolis and leprous lawgiver, remind one of the invitation sent by the true Joseph to his father and brethren, when he "informed them of all his state, and promised to supply them with all things necessary in abundance, to give them the good of the land of Egypt, to make them eat the fat of the land, bidding them make haste and come down without thinking of their property; for the good of all the land of Egypt should be theirs; so they accepted the invitation with great joy, and came immediately." One expression in Manetho's fable is even more appropriate in the mouth of the true Joseph who ruled Egypt than in that of the representative of the lepers. For among other promises to the Hierosolymites there is one to "take their part and stand by them," whenever there should be need: "*ὑπερμαχήσεσθαι δὲ ὅτε δέοι.*" For though Manetho meant this of armed co-operation, the offer of *occasional* assistance only, and the preposition *ὑπὲρ*, imply something of security and superiority in him who offers it. Even the numbers in the two fables are remarkable; the 511 years going back to the first Shepherd Abram; the number 80,000 for the lepers derived from him, when first reduced to bondage 94 years before the Exodus, a number perhaps not very different from the true: the force of the Shepherds set at 240,000 fighting men, that is, the full number at which the Egyptian army on the Syrian frontier *was usually stated*; their apprehensions from the quarter of Assyria, covering perhaps allusions to the exploits of Abraham, as well as to much later apprehensions of the Egyptians and actual invasion. But had the

true force of the Hebrews at the time of the Exodus been named, viz. 600,000 men, they would have seemed too strong for their oppressors; and if they were confessed to be unarmed, then an unarmed multitude [with the rod of Moses] had put to shame all the armies of the Egyptians with their gods. So they are numbered at only 240,000, but these fighting men; and the king Amenoph has 480,000, exactly double the number, all mighty men of valour, with which to overpower them; so that there is no room even to suspect that his return "without a battle" could be owing either to weakness or overthrow.

From the fables of Manetho there originated the definite historical error of confounding the Hebrews with the earlier Shepherds and Shepherd-kings (Hykshôs), under whom they had entered Egypt (the later sun-worshippers not being known or thought of), and their Exodus with the expulsion of the latter. Ptolemy of Mendes having given the synchronism of Amosis and Moses, with whom he joined Inachus, and Josephus having accepted the same as clearly asserted by Manetho, and as honourable to his own nation, they were followed by nearly all later writers, both Gentile and Christian. Only in some rare instances do we find traces either of some older and truer Egyptian tradition, or of some juster apprehension of the mixed nature of Manetho's fables. So in one passage, already noticed above, Syncellus writes that there was a sort of consensus that Joseph came into Egypt and rose to power under the Shepherds, and more particularly "in the 17th year of Apophis," an assertion which we have seen to be justified by the mixed scale of the Scriptures and the Chronicle, taking the names of the last four Shepherds with the last 184 of their years as they are given by Josephus, but which makes the Exodus to be, as it ought to be by the same scale, not under Amosis in B.C. 1748, but 94 years later. So again in a passage of Clement of Alexandria, who follows miscellaneous sources not always reconcilable with one another, it is said that the Exodus was "345 years before the epoch of the Sothic Cycle;" the only inaccuracy in which statement is this, that its author supposed Moses to have been born in the very first year of the

dynasty, and counted from the accession of Amosis to the Exodus only 81 years. For B.C. 1322 + 345 gives B.C. 1667: and if we deduct 81 from B.C. 1748, we obtain the same year, 1667. But really the particulars related in the first chapter of the Book of Exodus require some years to have elapsed between the first accession of the "king who knew not Joseph," and the order for exposing all the male children of the Hebrews. Not that one need think every thing that is mentioned to be included in the interval, or that the cities of Pithom, Rameses, and On (which last is added in the Greek) were built or walled by the Hebrews before the birth of Moses. This and other particulars may be mentioned by anticipation in a condensed narrative. On the other hand there is nothing in the name *Ramesses* in the Hebrew, or in the designation of the land of Goshen as *γῆ Παρυσσῆ* in the LXX., to justify the inference that the Exodus was after the time of Rameses the Great, who seems to have rebuilt Avaris and to have renamed it from himself. Else by the same rule it might be shown that some of the prophets wrote after the foundation of Alexandria, since Alexandria is named in the LXX. version of their books. This proves only that Ezra, or some other reviser still older, may have introduced into the text that name by which the place was known when the older name Avaris (Hawar) was entirely disused; though it is not impossible that the name Rameses may be as old as Moses himself, if Amosis, having a son named Rames, or Rameses, as the monuments show him to have had, named one of the cities which he fortified in the Delta after his son. But the other explanation is sufficient.

The indications derived from Manetho's fable that the Exodus took place not under Thothmes III. (Mephres), but under his son Amenoph II., would not of themselves be difficult to explain and set aside, if there were any sufficient reason to believe that the king of Egypt himself was drowned in the Red Sea: but the fact is, that they agree much better with the sacred narrative than does the commonly received opinion. The Scriptures introduce the account of the Exodus by marking the death of a king. "And it came to pass, in process of time, that the king of Egypt

died, and the children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage . . . and God heard their groaning . . . and had respect unto them." (Exod. ii. 23, 24, 25.) Hereupon Moses is sent from the Burning Bush on Mount Sinai to deliver them. This was, according to St. Stephen (Acts vii. 30), when 40 years were expired, "*πληρωθέντων*," were *complete*, from the time of his flight, his flight itself having been in his *fortieth* year, but before its completion: "*ὥς δὲ ἐπληροῦτο αὐτῷ τεσσαρακονταετῆς χρόνος*," κ. τ. λ. (Ib. v. 23.) But at the end of the 40th year from the Exodus, when Moses died, he was 120 years old. (Deut. i. 3, and xxxiv. 7.) So that the Exodus was just about the time when his 80th year was complete; and the death of the king of Egypt, the mission from the Burning Bush, and the Exodus, were all within one year, the first when Moses had not completed, the last when he had just completed, his 80th year. "Moses was fourscore years old, and Aaron fourscore and three years old, when they spake unto Pharaoh." (Exod. vii. 7.) But on looking at the Egyptian list of Dyn. XVIII, as given by Manetho, we find Amenoph I., the king under whom Moses should fly from Egypt, dying only five years afterwards: therefore *he* cannot be the king from whose death the history of the Exodus commences. But after him there follows a queen called Amesses for 21 years and 9 months; and after her there is only Thothmes III., called in the lists Mephres (the Mispthagmuthosis of Manetho's narrative); so that this last is necessarily the king whose death is specified, though some predecessor seems also to be alluded to when it is said to Moses that "*all the men are dead that sought thy life*." Thothmes, therefore, whom the Scripture joins, as if already on the throne 40 years before, with the actual persecutor of Moses, died some time in the summer or autumn of B. C. 1655; and the Exodus, being in the spring following, should be in the first *actual* year of his son Amenoph II., called Mephthagmuthosis in Manetho's lists, but Thuthmosis or Tethmosis in his narrative; an inference from the Scriptures as compared with the lists which agrees with the indications elicited above from Manetho's own fabulous narrative. Not only does the Scripture say no-

thing of the king being drowned, but Miriam in her song, dwelling with emphasis and repetition on "all Pharaoh's cavalry, his chariots and horsemen," "Pharaoh's chariots, his chosen captains," hints that neither the king himself nor the infantry of his army had entered the sea. "For the cavalry of Pharaoh went in, with his chariots and horsemen, into the sea; and the Lord brought again the waters of the sea upon them." "And the waters returned, and covered the chariots and the horsemen, and *all* the host of Pharaoh *that came into the sea after them*; there remained not so much as one of them." "And all the women went out after Miriam with timbrels and dances, and Miriam answered them [with this burden], Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea." (Exod. xv.) It is true that verse 15 of Psalm cxxxv. has been made to say in English, that "as for Pharaoh and his host he *overwhelmed* them in the Red Sea:" but this is an inaccurate paraphrase, owing to a peculiarity of expression in the Latin which was not understood. In the Psalms, as translated from the original Hebrew in the Anglican Bible, it is said more guardedly that he "*overthrew* Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea," with a marginal variation, "or *shaked off*," which last is the correct translation. For in the original Hebrew the word is נָחַם, in the Greek ἐκτινάξαντι, in the Latin *excussit*: "τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι Φαραὼ καὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ εἰς θάλασσαν ἐρυθρὰν," κ. τ. λ. "Et excussit Pharaonem et virtutem ejus in mari rubro;" i. e. "who flung off or dashed back Pharaoh and his pursuing force *into* or *in* or *at* (the Hebrew preposition covers equally the three senses) the Red Sea;" "into," if one thinks of them as a cloud of hornets, all of them dashed back, many of them falling into the sea, and some, it may be, falling on the bank; "in," because the act of discomfiture itself was done in the midst of the sea, not because Pharaoh personally, or all his force to a man, were overthrown or overwhelmed by bodily drowning; "at" needs no explanation. As for ecclesiastical writers, they, no doubt, have mostly held the commoner opinion, which seems recommended by a sort of poetical propriety, till we notice

that in other instances also the type is in some marked feature left imperfect, to show that the full reality is still to come. Thus Joseph dreamed that the sun and the moon, and the eleven stars, meaning his father *and mother*, and his eleven brethren were to bow down to him. And when his eleven brethren and his father came into Egypt, he being then the lord of the land, the whole might have seemed to be accomplished and terminated, but that the *mother* was dead long before. Leah also had died, and had been buried at Hebron by her husband. So it was clear that Joseph was only a figure, and that the true and perfect Joseph was yet to come, who should be adored by his *mother*, as well as by his father and his brethren. So also there is another and more complete Exodus, in which all the hosts of evil, *with their king*, are to be overwhelmed for ever.

Some perhaps are not yet satisfied, but insist on having a Pharaoh to be drowned; and if they can find traces of a king who reigned less than a year between Thothmes III. and his son Amenoph II., or like to imagine such a king without traces, this idea in itself is certainly admissible. The Egyptians would be sure to suppress the memory of a reign so disastrous, which might leave no monuments; and its imperfect year, if all subsequent to Oct. 12, B.C. 1655, might be covered by the ante-dated accession of his successor. But the monuments seem to forbid this supposition. And Thothmes III. cannot be surrendered to them without causing much greater difficulties. It is true that as we have drawn out the chronology, making the 25 years and 4 months of Amosis to begin from Nov. 4, B.C. 1748, and giving Amesses 21.9^m., according to our present text of Josephus, Thothmes III. seems to die suspiciously near the time of the Exodus, in the spring of B.C. 1654. And the monuments supply another indication, approaching still nearer to a *proof*, that he and no other is the king under whom the Exodus took place. For in the mounds of Heliopolis, one of the cities according to the LXX. which were fortified by the labour of the Hebrews, many sun-baked bricks bearing the stamp of Thothmes III. have been used, which, on being broken, show that they were made *without straw*; whereas ordinarily the earth of which these

bricks are made is held together by a mixture of chopped straw. It is impossible not to see how this singularity is accounted for by the Scriptures. The demands made by Moses and Aaron in favour of the Hebrews had led only to an aggravation of their servitude. Straw was no longer supplied to them. They were required to get it for themselves as they could, and yet to deliver the same tale of bricks. So when in spite of all the threats of the taskmasters the bricks fell short, and their native officers were beaten, and they complained to Pharaoh, instead of obtaining any redress they are again told by the tyrant that they are only idle, and are absolutely required to make the full tale of bricks as before. The consequence, though it be not written, is easily seen. They would make with straw as many bricks as they could, and fill up the tale required, when straw fell short, by making bricks without it. So there is a strong probability that the bricks found bearing the name of Thothmes III., and made without straw, were made at that particular time. Yet after all, this amounts to no positive proof that Thothmes III. was still on the throne. If indeed it had been several years after his death that the tyranny was so aggravated, it would have been next to impossible that bricks made for his successor should be found still bearing his name; but within a few months only after his death, if a multitude of 600,000 men were forced to work against time in making bricks, it is next to certain that they would still continue, in some cases, to use the old moulds for a reason similar to that which obliged them to make some of the bricks without straw.

But for the appearance exhibited by the lists, as if Thothmes III. died within a month of the Passover in B.C. 1654, this is only on the double assumption, shown above to be altogether improbable, that the actual reign of Amosis, the head of the dynasty, according to Manetho, as well as his reign technically antedated according to the Chronicle, began from Thoth 1, that is, from Nov. 4 in B.C. 1748, and that its length was reckoned both by the author of the Chronicle and by Manetho alike to have been 25 years and 4 months from this date. According to Manetho's own *apparent* chronology Thothmes III., even with the two assumptions above men-

tioned, would live on till the spring of B.C. 1653, three years after the Exodus, Manetho having thrown up from the time of anarchy preceding Dyn. XXVI to the head of his whole series of kings three years, which depress all dates below them, so that the head of Dyn. XVIII would be thereby depressed from Nov. 4, B.C. 1748, to B.C. 1745. And besides this, the preceding Dynasty XVII (XV of Africanus) ending according to the mixed lists of Josephus and Africanus, as pieced together by us, with a fraction of 10 months, and the actual reign of Amosis following with its 25 years and 4 months, this latter reign in technical reckoning, such as that of the Chronicle, would be antedated so as to include the last ten months of the Shepherds; and all the dates of Dyn. XVIII would be one year higher than if the actual accession of Amosis had been at the new year, and the Shepherds instead of 259.10^m. had ruled 260 full years and had left no fraction. So Thothmes III. would die not at the end of March B.C. 1654, but at the end of March B.C. 1653. Or if Dyn. XVIII were made to begin without antedating from the actual end of Dyn. XVII, two months before the new year, then Thothmes III. would die not at the end of March, but at the end of January, in B.C. 1654, *two* months too early for the Exodus.

Thus far we have been dealing only with the lists of Manetho for Dyn. XVIII; for though it is idle to dwell on figures or even names in lists purposely adulterated like those of Eusebius and Syncellus, original lists, or what come to us as if copied from such, are to be taken as either simply true, or at least as reconcilable with truth. They must not be altered to suit indications of other writers, or even of monuments; still less to introduce new arrangements and theories of our own: for they are the only possible framework which all investigators can agree to follow, at least provisionally and conventionally, and to which all fresh accessions of knowledge can be attached. And in a work like the present, aiming only at a general and conjectural reconstruction of the written schemes of the Chronicle, Manetho, Eratosthenes, and Ptolemy of Mendes, it is not absolutely necessary to discuss questions of detail raised from the monuments by students who, however acute and laborious, are far from

having obtained as yet any complete outline of history to substitute for that of the lists. Still, as the monumental notices of Dyn. XVIII are very numerous, and its monumental names and succession may be paralleled to a great extent with those of the lists, and as some facts attested by the monuments seem to set aside our foregoing reasonings based on the lists alone, some notice of the monuments, both for this and for the following dynasties, may be expected by the reader, and shall be given.

As regards the reign of Amosis, the founder of Dyn. XVIII, his 22nd year is found marked in the quarries of Masarah, nearly opposite to Memphis; and in an inscription in the tomb of an officer of the same name, Aahmes Pensuben, at El Kab, which has been illustrated by Mr. Birch and M. De Rougé, a number of battles or campaigns are mentioned as having occurred during the war with the Shepherds between the accession of Amosis and his *sixth* year, when Avaris had already been taken. The owner of the tomb alluded to was born according to his own account of himself under the king Raskennen; on the accession of Amosis he "was still a child," that is, under age; nevertheless he went with him to the war against Avaris (Hawar), seemingly in his first year. The place was not taken, and the campaign having necessarily ended at least four months before the end of the Egyptian year, which about B.C. 1748 was at November 4, the king went to Memphis, and was there *crowned*. So that, although Avaris was still unreduced, the kingdom of Memphis, which had existed throughout under native princes vassals to the Shepherds, was now already united to the kingdom of Upper Egypt. And from this coronation it was, no doubt, that the author of the Chronicle would make his Dyn. XVIII, expressly named by him *Memphite*, commence, just as he had made the preceding Dyn. XXVII of the Shepherds and their 184 years of sovereignty commence not from their first settlement in the Delta, but from their reduction of Memphis, irrespectively of the kingdom of Upper Egypt, which continued independent until long afterwards. Considering the season at which the new year then was, it is not impossible that it was

selected for the day of the coronation in preference to the anniversary of the king's actual and first accession in Upper Egypt. After this a second, a third, and a fourth battle or campaign before Avaris are mentioned, the last ending in a repulse; but the *fifth* mention of hostilities ends with the capture of Avaris; and the sixth is connected with the siege of another place, Scharhana, supposed to be beyond the Syrian frontier, and it is expressly fixed to the *sixth* year of the king. After having conquered the Shepherds, the inscription continues, the king made a campaign in Chent-nefer, (that is, in the more distant parts of Nubia, near the gold region,) and there also he was victorious. "So he was master both in the south and in the north." After all this there are still mentioned two later expeditions into Nubia under the same king Amosis, the latter of them occasioned by a revolt, and another under his successor Amenoph I., when Aahmes, who relates his own exploits, was now a general. His life of service is said to have continued even to the [beginning of the] reign of Thothmes III., which by the lists would imply a space of $(25.4^m. + 13 + 20.7^m. + 21.9^m. + 1 =) 82$ years, so that if he were only 16 years old when he first accompanied Amosis to war, he would seem by the lists to have been at least 98 at his death. But to return to Amosis: His queen (or one at least, and the principal of his queens, if there were two) named Aahmes Nofriari was honoured and worshipped even to the end of the dynasty in an extraordinary way, and above her husband. She appears on many monuments both with him, and after his death with his successor, with the titles "Royal Daughter, Royal Wife, and Royal Mother," wearing sometimes the double crown or *pshent*, and painted not yellow (the conventional colour for Egyptian women), nor red or chocolate-coloured like Egyptian and Nubian men, but coal-black, which is a clear sign of the Ethiopian connection of this dynasty. For one or two of the Sevekhotebs and Neferhotebs, kings whom we have placed chiefly in Nubia and have referred to Dyn. XIV of Africanus (XVI of the original Manetho), have been found painted black in the same manner. One of these may be seen on a granite altar in the museum at Leyden.

It may be remarked in passing that the Ethiopian connection, and in part origin, of Dyn. XVIII throws light on a passage in the book of Numbers (xii. 1), where it is mentioned that Moses had once "married an Ethiopian woman;" for such a circumstance becomes very intelligible if he were bred up as the adopted son of "Pharaoh's daughter," when the queen-mother was herself an Ethiopian, and naturally had other ladies from Ethiopia about her. A Jewish fable in Josephus makes Moses go himself into Ethiopia with the command of an army; and thus far there is nothing to dispute against, since we know that in his earlier life also he "was mighty both in words and in deeds;" and the *southernmost* parts of Ethiopia were still unconquered, or they might rebel. But when it is added that as he was in the enemy's country the king's daughter fell in love with him, and purchased his hand by betraying her father's capital to the Egyptians, such an account of his Ethiopian marriage falls to the ground before the much more probable and natural explanation which is hinted by contemporary Egyptian monuments.

Amosis and the black queen Aahmes Nofriari are uniformly followed not only on particular contemporary monuments, but in the monumental lists of Thebes and Abydos, by Amenoph I., who was certainly the son of Amosis, but cannot be shown to have been succeeded by any son of his own. Between Amosis and Amenoph on the monuments there is no trace of the name "Chebron," nor of any other intervening king. But *after* Amenoph there is a king, Thothmes I., the chief element of whose throne-name "*Chepr*" may possibly be the source of the name "*Chebron*," and who *must* be identified with the Chebron of Manetho, unless Manetho be supposed first to have interpolated before Amenoph I. a king purely fictitious, and then to have suppressed after him a real king by way of compensation, which is not probable. Of Thothmes I. the monuments record a campaign in *Mesopotamia* in his second year, and they give the name of his queen "*Aahmes*," who seems to be the same with a sister of Amenoph I. named Amon-merit and Aahmes. Amon-merit may perhaps be the source of the Μέρρις, daughter of Παλ-

μανώθης, head of the dynasty, and wife of Χεφεφρῆς (Chem-br-es for Chebr-os or Chebr-on), in the passage cited above from Artapanus. And in the Alexandrian Chronicle Χεφεβρών (Chembron for Chebron) is named as the king under whom Moses was brought up. We may conjecture then that Thothmes I., or, as he is called by Manetho, Chebron, married the daughter of Amosis, the sister consequently of Amenoph I., named after her mother Aahmes, and that he reigned after Amenoph I. by her right, not by his own; yet that he was a collateral of the family of Amosis, and so her cousin, the name "Thoth" in composition appearing first with him, while the termination "*mes*," equivalent to the Greek γενῆς, and the Latin *genitus*, is characteristic of the whole lineage of Amosis, properly written Aahmes (Luni-genitus). And if so, and if either he himself or his chief wife and queen, the daughter of Amosis, were older than her brother Amenoph I., this might perhaps account for his name having got before that of Amenoph I. in some genealogical list which Manetho followed. Leaving then the *reigns*, apart from the names, to stand for the *present* in the order of Manetho's list, but transposing the two names of Chebron or Thothmes I. and Amenoph I., as the monuments require, so that Amenoph succeeds Amosis and reigns 13 years, and Thothmes I., succeeding Amenoph, reigns 20 years and 7 months, we shall have seemingly in all ($25.4^m. + 13 + 20.7^m. =$) 58 years and 11 months from the actual Theban accession of Amosis to the end of the reign of Thothmes I.

After Thothmes I. and his queen Aahmes, who is styled "Royal Wife, Divine Spouse, Lady of Both Countries, and Great Royal Sister," and who appears also as regent, and seems to have survived her husband, we find on contemporary monuments a *queen*, whose original name was *Hatasu*, but who reigned by the names *Chuum-t-amen* and *Ra-ma-ka*. At the beginning of her reign she is represented as being yet quite a young woman, and has a consort, Thothmes II., *Ra-aa-en-cheperu*, whom some call her brother, and who may really have been a cousin. He is inserted in the later monumental lists of Abydos, the Ramesseum, and Medinet Habou, Hatasu being omitted; while in Manetho's lists on the other

hand Thothmes II. is omitted, and a queen, not identifiable however in name with Hatasu, but named "Amesses," appears in the place where either Hatasu or her consort might be expected. Associated with Hatasu, besides Thothmes II., there appears also later on contemporary monuments (from which he has afterwards effaced her name to reduplicate his own) her younger brother, or half-brother, Thothmes III., who is found both on separate monuments of his own, and in the later monumental lists, and in Manetho's written lists. The 16th year of Hatasu or Ramaka, having her brother Thothmes III. then associated with her, but *taking precedence of him*, is marked on a stele at Wadi-Magara; and the Karnak inscription illustrated by Mr. Birch, connecting the 5th campaign of Thothmes III. with his 29th year, and his 10th campaign with his 35th, shows that his first campaign was not later than his 25th year, nor, probably, earlier than his 23rd, and so justifies the inference that the 21 years and 9 months which precede his place in Manetho's lists really represent that portion of his monumental reign which preceded his first campaign. For Manetho in Josephus gives to his queen "Amesses" described as "sister" to the king preceding her, that is to Amenoph I., a reign of 21 years and 9 months [or 21 and 1^m. according to the reading of Theophilus], and to Thothmes III., who follows her under the name of Miphres, a reign of 12 years and 9 months. If these two reigns were thrown together on the supposition that Thothmes III., when he came to reign alone, antedated his accession, and reckoned his years from the death of his father Thothmes I., they would give us for the whole monumental reign of Thothmes III. a space of 34 years and 6 months [or 33 and 10^m]. But the Karnak inscription marks a sixteenth campaign of this king, which cannot have been earlier than his 41st year, and probably was not so early: and in another inscription, as it is said, even his 47th has been found; so as to justify the inference that, besides the 21 years and 9 months preceding his first campaign, 13 other years, *following* the 12 years and 9 months allowed him by Manetho, have been cut off from the end of his reign, which really from first to last covered a space of 47 years

and 6 months [or 46 and 10 months]. This being so, the next question is where to find in the lists the 13 years wanted? Have they been simply reckoned by Manetho to the next reign, so as still to stand in their true chronological places? or have they been transposed to some other place not their own? For the first supposition the monuments, as will appear below, leave no room. But if we cast our eyes upwards above the reign of Thothmes III., we see just that number of 13 years which we want joined with a name which the monuments have forced us to eject or transpose from the place where it stands, so as by this very fact to suggest a suspicion that the years are to be transposed too, and perhaps separately. This suspicion becomes certainty when we consider the details already referred to of the life of Aahmes Pensuben, who having entered upon service while yet only a lad in the first year of Amosis, is recorded to have been still living, and seemingly still serving, under Thothmes III., that is at least during the year of his first campaign dated by himself, we suppose, as his 23rd. But 82 years of service, which would thus be given to Aahmes if all the reigns named by him are to be computed according to the lists, are so improbable, as of themselves to make one doubt whether the lists are really to be so applied. And when we have proof from other sources that 13 years have been *suppressed* in the lists a little lower down, and transferred to some other place than their own, it is clear that the unchronological addition, the place of which it would have been our business to detect, has shown itself here of its own accord, and needs not to be searched for elsewhere. Even when the 13 years given in the lists to Chebron have been transposed, so as to make the requisite addition to the reign of Thothmes III., bringing it up from the 12 years and 9 months of the lists to 25 years and 9 months, Aahmes Pensuben will still be scarcely less than 85 years old, and will have seen at least 69 years of service, if he served both in the first campaign of Amosis and in the first campaign of Thothmes III. his fourth successor. It is remarkable that Aahmes Pensuben, though he mentions serving the queen Ra-ma-ka (i. e. Hatasu), and nursing her daughter (who

seems to have died young), adds this separately, while the series named before in connection with his military service is the same as that of the monumental lists: "I served," he says, "the king *Ra-neb-peh* (Amosis); I served the king *Ra-ser-ka* (Amenoph I.); I served the king *Ra-aa-cheper-ka* (Thothmes I.); I served also the king *Ra-aa-en-cheper* (Thothmes II.)," with other matter between each name; and then in the next column, "I served also the queen *Ra-ma-ka* (Hatasu); I nursed her daughter the princess *Ra-nofreon* deceased;" . . . and lastly is mentioned his still living and serving "the king *Ra-men-cheper*" (Thothmes III.).

We infer then that the 20 years and 7 months given in the lists of Manetho to Amenoph I. really cover the two reigns of that king and his brother-in-law Thothmes I.; and that of the joint sum of the two reigns Amenoph probably had 13 years (since Manetho must have had *some* reason for cutting off 13 years, rather than 12 or 14, from the reign of Thothmes III.), and Thothmes I. or Chebron may have reigned the remaining 7 years and 7 months.

Lastly, we may suppose that the "Amesses" of Manetho, being the daughter of Amosis, sister of Amenoph I., wife of Thothmes I. and mother of Hatasu, having been left a widow, with her children all as yet quite young, continued to govern for them as regent, either till her death, or till the marriage of her daughter with Thothmes II. So the 21 years and 9 months in Manetho's lists may be a consolidation of the two female regencies of Aahmes and Hatasu, mother and daughter, into one, the name of Aahmes prevailing because she was originally the heiress, and the title of her daughter (to say nothing of her daughter's consort) was derived from her.

After the death of Thothmes III. the monuments require us to allow with Manetho *at least* 25 years and 10 months and 9 years and 8 months (making in all 35 years and 6 months) to the two reigns of Amenoph II. (called in the lists of Manetho *Misphra-muthosis*) and Thothmes IV. respectively. But the following reign, that of Amenoph III., the monuments *force* us to extend beyond the length of 30 years and 10 months given for it by 5 full years, as its 36th current year has been found marked. What may have been the

purpose of Manetho in suppressing and transferring elsewhere the last years of a legitimate reign either in this case, or in the similar case of Thothmes III., is hard to determine. One may *suspect* that it was done in order to obscure the true sequence of history at two points of time connected with great national calamity and reproach.

After Amenoph III. two successors at least, Amon-anchut, with his 4th year marked, and the sun-worshipping king Khouen or Quashan (with a local "king of Thebes" named Ai in his suite) are interposed by the monuments before they give us Horus, the next name to Amenoph III. in Manetho's lists. The time of the sun-worshippers, reckoned seemingly as 15 full years from Thoth 1 to Thoth 1, exclusively of such odd months as no doubt also belonged to them, having been suppressed by Manetho and prefixed to Dyn. XIX, must be restored so as to come in after the death of Amenoph III., if, as is said to be the case, the reign of the sun-worshipper preceded that of Amon-anchut. The reign of this latter, omitted in all the lists, is no doubt reckoned by them to Horus, from whose 36 years and 5 months the 5 years added by the monuments to his father Amenoph III. will have to be subtracted.

After Horus, except one name, and that illegible, thought by M. Mariette to be the Rathotis of the lists, the monuments give us nothing till the time of the king commonly known as Rameses I., grandfather of Rameses the Great. His monumental name "Ramessou, or Armessou," is probably the source of the "Armesses" or "Armais" of the lists. His successor Seti I. *must* be the Rameses of the lists on the same principle by which Thothmes I. has been identified above with Chebron. For it cannot be supposed that Manetho omitted entirely such a king as Seti I., one of the most illustrious for his victories and for his monumental records, to substitute, in the very place belonging to him, a merely fictitious and supernumerary Rameses unknown to the monuments. But as Manetho in a fable which blends Seti II. and Rameses III. together with Seti I. and Rameses the Great all into one person says of Seti II. that "he was also named Rameses" (Σέθως ὁ καὶ Ῥαμεσσῆς), so here in his

lists he goes further, and names Seti I. simply "Rameses," omitting his more proper name Sethos. It is indeed possible that the name Rameses was applicable to all the kings descendants of Ramessou-Armesses or Rameses I., whether they took it in their cartouches or not. The title Mi-amon also, afterwards a distinctive surname of Rameses II., was taken occasionally by the father; and many circumstances combined to blend the reigns, the names, and even the persons of the two kings, father and son, into one. Still it is certainly strange that Manetho should here omit the name Sethos altogether and name only Rameses, while Diodorus and other later writers, on the other hand, omit the name Rameses, and merge Rameses the Great himself in his father under the name "Sesoosis," which is only a variation of Sethos or Sethosis, meant by them to represent "Sesostris."

Rameses II. (the Great) who should have been Rameses III. if his father were truly named Rameses, follows next, with the innumerable and magnificent monuments of his long reign. What is strange—stranger even than Manetho's omission of the name of his father—is that this great king, with his reign of over 66 years, has dropped out from one of the lists, the list of Africanus; or at least from that copy of the list of Africanus which Syncellus transcribed; for in the list of Eusebius, also copied, though unfaithfully, from Africanus, he is found. The name of his son and successor on the monuments, Merienphtha, being identified with the Amenophis of the lists, concludes the dynasty.

On a general review we shall now be able perhaps to distinguish on what grounds the Chronicle reckoned to this Dyn. XVIII *fourteen generations*, while the monumental lists of Thebes and Abydos give a series of *thirteen* legitimate *kings*; and the written lists of Manetho and his epitomists count *sixteen* or *seventeen* names, while the actual reigns of all kinds, if thrown together, seem to have been not fewer than twenty-two.

(Generation I., reign i.) *Aahmes*, *Ra-neb-peh*, and his black queen, *Aahmes Nofriari*. In his 1st Theban year he warred against Avaris, but did not take it. In the same year, when the season for war was over (in the summer of

25 Nov. 4,
B. C. 1748, to
Oct. 29, B. C.
1723.

B.C. 1747), he was *crowned* at Memphis. In his 5th, seemingly, he took Avaris and expelled the Shepherdæ. In his 6th, he seems to have been still occupied with the remains of the war with the Shepherds, but no longer within the frontiers of Egypt. After his 6th year, he was free to turn his arms southwards, and was victorious in further Ethiopia, as he had been in the Delta and on the Syrian frontier. In his 22nd year he quarried stone at Toura for the temples of Phtha at Memphis and of Ammon at Thebes. This is his latest date as yet found.

As his Memphite accession, and with it the commencement of Dyn. XVIII is put by the Chronicle at Thoth 1, = Nov. 4th of the anticipated and uncorrected Julian year B.C. 1748, and as so put is no doubt antedated (unless, indeed, the coronation was deferred for five months or more after the campaign, and then celebrated on the very day of the new year), it follows that the actual coronation and accession of Amosis at Memphis must have been in B.C. 1747, some short time after the season for war was over, and when the water season was approaching or had commenced. So if we calculate that it was probably not much more than five months, nor much less than three, before the end of the Egyptian year, and take four months as a mean, we may assume that the coronation was on or about July 2, B.C. 1747, and that the actual Theban accession of Amosis had been one year, more or less, but necessarily, and at the least, eight months earlier. As for the 25 years and 4 months given him by Manetho, Manetho's own method requires that they should date from some *actual* accession, whether Theban or Memphite; and there can be little doubt that they date, in fact, historically and chronologically from his first actual accession at Thebes, while the later Memphite accession (technically antedated from Thoth 1 preceding) is certainly the epoch of the Chronicle. Manetho, no doubt, presents the 542 years of his Dynasties XVIII and XIX as parallel to the same 542 years of the same dynasties in the Chronicle, and as consequently coinciding for their commencement in Thoth 1 = Nov. 4, B.C. 1748. But he himself is at no pains to make this parallelism more than apparent,

having in his series above the head of Dyn. XVIII three years (in our patched reconstruction two years and ten months) thrown up from times far below, so that the first year of Dyn. XVIII and all the rest are really depressed by three places below the points of coincidence required for them as they are paralleled with the years of Dynasties XVIII and XIX of the Chronicle. Nor is this enough, but Manetho adds to these two inconsistent reckonings a third equally inconsistent with them both, when he says expressly that the 25 years and 4 months of Amosis are all to be reckoned to him from "after the expulsion" of the Shepherds, i.e. from after the capture of Avaris, which we now know from the monuments to have been in his *fifth* year, and certainly not on Thoth 1, in B.C. 1748, nor on Thoth 1 at all. But without considering that apparent chronology of Manetho which is freely disregarded by himself, having put the Memphite accession of Amosis at July 2, B.C. 1747, and the Theban a year earlier, we have only 24 years and 4 months to reckon to his actual reign, as included within the limits of Dyn. XVIII of the Chronicle, or 25 full years to his technical reign as antedated from Thoth 1 = Nov. 4 in the autumn preceding. Thus the Memphite reign, as antedated by the Chronicle, differs from the actual Theban reign of Manetho by 4 months, which having been depressed by Manetho so as to begin within Dyn. XVIII of the Chronicle, and having been by us ejected, will leave a void below at some point or other, where Manetho must have suppressed four months really belonging to the dynasty. We reckon, then, 4 months of the reign of Amosis as already past at the commencement of Dynasty XVIII; and then the remaining 25 full years common to Manetho and the Chronicle will begin, according to the chronology of the Chronicle, from Thoth 1 = Nov. 4, B.C. 1748, and will end Oct. 29, B.C. 1723.

(Generation II. reign ii.) *Amenhotep I., Ra-sor-ka.* His queen is named Aah-hotep, though some think Aah-hotep was a wife of Amosis. The 1st year only of Amenoph I. has been found. If he reigned 13 years, his actual reign would be coincident, or very nearly, with his reign as

13. Oct. 29,
B.C. 1723, to
Oct. 26, B.C.
1710.

technically reckoned from Thoth 1 = Oct. 29, B. C. 1723, to Thoth 1 = Oct. 25, B. C. 1710, when Moses would be in his 25th year.

7. Oct. 25,
B. C. 1710, to
Oct. 24, B. C.
1703.

(Generation II. reign iii.) *Thothmes I., Ra-aa-cheper-ka*, consort and probably cousin of *Aahmes Merit-amon*, sister of Amenoph I. and daughter of Amosis, the Amesses of Manetho, who seems to have reigned on after the death of her husband till her daughter *Hatasu* was of age and married. She, if any one, of the princesses known to us from the monuments, should be that "daughter of Pharaoh" who took up Moses from the water, and educated him as her own son. Probably what is asserted of her is true, that she had no other son really her own. If her consort Thothmes I. (whose 2nd year only has been found on the monuments) reigned in all 7 years and 7 months, his 7 years, as technically reckoned, would lie between Oct. 26, B. C. 1710, and Oct. 24, B. C. 1703, his death being 7 months later, May 22, B. C. 1702. At this time Moses was 32 years of age; and since he declined to become the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and "preferred the reproach of Christ to the riches and pleasures of Egypt," we may infer that they were once within his reach, and that it would have suited the policy as well as inclination of his adoptive mother to marry her daughter Hatasu, as soon as she was of age, to him rather than to some collateral, who might use the rank of king-consort only for the aggrandisement of his own branch. After the death of Thothmes I. one may suppose it was, and during the regency of Amesses, included probably under the next reign of Manetho, that Moses had the fullest opportunity of showing himself "mighty both in words and in deeds," and worthy of that rank to which the queen-mother would have raised him. And after he had declined to become, in the strictest sense, "the son of Pharaoh's daughter, he was married so as to be free to acknowledge his true kindred, and yet to such a wife as showed a connection with the court. And his position, even after the marriage of the princess Hatasu, under her consort Thothmes II. was still such, that he thought the Hebrews, his brethren, "would understand how that by his arm God would deliver them,"

so soon as he stood up in their behalf and showed himself ready to represent them. "But they understood not."

(Generation III, reign of Manetho iv, not in the monumental lists.) Under the name Amesses (*Aahmes* of the monuments) Manetho seems to have included both the regency of Aahmes, and the longer reign of her daughter *Hatasu*, named as queen *Chnum-t-amen*, *Ra-ma-ka*, which again includes that of her consort *Thothmes II.*, *Ra-aa-encheper* (reign iv of the monumental lists, omitted by Manetho). *Hatasu* seems to have reigned not only as regent and guardian of *Thothmes III.* (probably only her half-brother), but also by her mother's right and her own. How long precisely her mother Amesses was regent, and whether *Hatasu* with *Thothmes II.* reigned from her mother's death, or rather from the time of her own marriage, while Amesses was still living, is uncertain. Only it would seem that the regency of Amesses can scarcely have lasted more than six years, whether it be covered by the 7 years and 7 months of *Thothmes I.*, or by the 21 years and 9 months of the Amesses of the lists. For the 2nd year of *Thothmes I.* and the 16th year of *Hatasu* have been found. And so, even if *Hatasu* reigned only 16 years current in all, which is the minimum possible, there would be but 6 years current preceding them at the head of Manetho's 21 years and 9 months for the regency of her mother. The whole joint reign as reckoned technically would have 22 years, from Oct. 24 B.C. 1703 to Oct. 18 B.C. 1681, and would leave a fraction of 4 months over ending Feb. 15 B.C. 1680. Within this space the marriage and the joint accession of *Hatasu* and her consort *Thothmes II.* cannot well be placed later than *Thoth I* = Oct. 22, B.C. 1697. In the 3rd year after this it was, in B.C. 1694, that the king, who should be *Thothmes II.* the consort of *Hatasu*, "sought to slay Moses," and Moses fled from Egypt. It seems to be hinted by what was said to Moses nearly 40 years later, upon the death of *Thothmes III.*, viz. that "*all the men*" in the plural, who had sought his life, were then dead, that *Thothmes III.*, though no doubt only a boy, was already on the throne in B.C. 1694, that is, in the 9th year after the death of his

22. Fr
Oct. 24, 1703, to Oct. 18, B.C. 1681

technically reckoned from Thoth 1 = Oct. 29, B. C. 1723, to Thoth 1 = Oct. 25, B. C. 1710, when Moses would be in his 25th year.

7. Oct. 25,
B. C. 1710, to
Oct. 24, B. C.
1703.

(Generation II. reign iii.) *Thothmes I., Ra-aa-cheper-ka*, consort and probably cousin of *Aahmes Merit-amon*, sister of Amenoph I. and daughter of Amosis, the Amesses of Manetho, who seems to have reigned on after the death of her husband till her daughter *Hatasu* was of age and married. She, if any one, of the princesses known to us from the monuments, should be that "daughter of Pharaoh" who took up Moses from the water, and educated him as her own son. Probably what is asserted of her is true, that she had no other son really her own. If her consort Thothmes I. (whose 2nd year only has been found on the monuments) reigned in all 7 years and 7 months, his 7 years, as technically reckoned, would lie between Oct. 26, B. C. 1710, and Oct. 24, B. C. 1703, his death being 7 months later, May 22, B. C. 1702. At this time Moses was 32 years of age; and since he declined to become the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and "preferred the reproach of Christ to the riches and pleasures of Egypt," we may infer that they were once within his reach, and that it would have suited the policy as well as inclination of his adoptive mother to marry her daughter Hatasu, as soon as she was of age, to him rather than to some collateral, who might use the rank of king-consort only for the aggrandisement of his own branch. After the death of Thothmes I. one may suppose it was, and during the regency of Amesses, included probably under the next reign of Manetho, that Moses had the fullest opportunity of showing himself "mighty both in words and in deeds," and worthy of that rank to which the queen-mother would have raised him. And after he had declined to become, in the strictest sense, "the son of Pharaoh's daughter, he was married so as to be free to acknowledge his true kindred, and yet to such a wife as showed a connection with the court. And his position, even after the marriage of the princess Hatasu, under her consort Thothmes II. was still such, that he thought the Hebrews understand how that by his arm

• • •

al
es
C.
bo
he
th
nu
o
ha
II
ser
s
B
pti
ont
hot
162

father, when there were only 13 years more and some months of the actual reign of his sister Hatasu still to come. So this date would be in her 3rd year, if she reigned *only* the 16 years current which are required by the inscription of her 16th, and which in that case may have begun from Oct. 20, B.C. 1697, after her mother's actual regency had lasted 5 years and 5 months, reckoned technically as 6 years, from the death of Thothmes I. But the reign of Hatasu may very possibly have had more than this length of 15 years and 4 months; and she may have associated her half-brother Thothmes III. with herself from the first; or even it may be that the regency during her own minority was administered by the queen-mother Amesses in their joint names. But these points are at present only matters of conjecture. Thus much however appears, that the consort of Hatasu, Thothmes II., was still living in B.C. 1694 when Moses fled from Egypt (since there was then a Pharaoh who sought to slay him); and consequently it is not open to suppose that it was only upon his death that she strengthened herself by associating in the throne her half-brother Thothmes III., not yet old enough to be any cause of jealousy.

48. From Oct.
24, B.C. 1703,
or 26 from
Oct. 18, B.C.
1681, to Oct.
12, A.C. 1655.

(Generation III, reign of Manetho v, of the monumental lists v.) *Thothmes III., Ra-men-cheper* (who in some of the numerous variants of his name has the title *Mi[-ph]-ra*). He appears with his sister the queen Hatasu or Ra-ma-ka, but as subordinate to her, at Wadi Magara in an inscription of her 16th year. His own second year *as reigning alone* is marked at Assouan; but generally his years are antedated from the death of his father; and so his 5th campaign is connected in the great inscription from Karnak with his 29th year, his 6th with his 30th, and his 10th with his 35th year. His 16th campaign is named, though its date is wanting. In his 42nd year he erected a sitting statue still preserved to "his brother" (that is, the consort of his sister, and probably his cousin), Thothmes II.; and elsewhere even his 47th year is said to be found. His conquests extended as far as "Nineveh" and the banks of the Tigris; and the list of the tributes paid to him from conquered countries has been in part preserved by sculptures on his additions to the great temple of

Karnak. Under him the oppression of the Hebrews reached its highest point; and from his death it is that the narrative of the Exodus begins. But if the death of his father Thothmes I. be conjecturally fixed to May 22, B.C. 1702, when he was a boy perhaps 5 years old, his own death, if placed 47 years and 6 months later, will be at Nov. 11, B.C. 1655, 5 months or thereabouts before the Exodus. But if in point of fact the Theban accession of Amosis should have been somewhat earlier than we have estimated, or if the variant given by Theophilus of Antioch of 21 years and 1 month instead of 9 months for the reign of Amesses should be more than a mere error, the death of Thothmes would be proportionably earlier, though by another and separate line of reasoning it may be concluded that it did not precede the Exodus by so much as a full year. The reign would be reckoned technically by the Chronicle at 48 years from Oct. 24, B.C. 1703, to Oct. 12, B.C. 1655.

(Generation IV, reign of Manetho vi, of the monumental lists vi.) *Amenhotep II., Ra-aa-cheperu*, son of Thothmes III. If his actual accession be rightly put at Nov. 11, B.C. 1655, then as technically antedated his reign would be reckoned from Oct. 12 preceding in the same year, and the Exodus would seem to be later in his first year by one month than it was in truth. His 3rd year only is marked, in a temple founded by him at Amada in Nubia.

25. Oct. 24,
B.C. 1655, to
Oct. 5, B.C.
1630.

(Generation V, reign of Manetho vii, and of the monumental lists vii.) *Thothmes IV., Ra-men-cheperu*, son of Amenoph II. His 4th year is marked at Sarabeit el Khadeem, and his 7th on the great obelisk of Thothmes III. now standing at St. John Lateran's at Rome; it is mentioned also that this same obelisk remained in the hands of the workmen 35 years, from the death of Thothmes III. to some date not given in the reign of Thothmes IV. But according to the reckoning of the lists (which this inscription justifies) Amenoph II. should reign 25 years and 10 months from Nov. 11, B.C. 1655, to Aug. 31, B.C. 1629; and Thothmes IV. 9 years and 8 months from Aug. 31, B.C. 1629, to May 1, B.C. 1619. The two reigns make together only 35 years and 6 months. So the inscription on the obelisk

10. Oct. 5,
B.C. 1630, to
Oct. 3, B.C.
1620.

would seem to have been dated within 6 months before the death of Thothmes IV. But in technical reckoning Amenoph II. will have 25 years from Oct. 12, B. C. 1655, to Oct. 5, B. C. 1630; and Thothmes IV. will have 10 years from Oct. 5, B. C. 1630, to Oct. 3, B. C. 1620; leaving 7 months to be reckoned to his successor.

36. Oct. 3,
B. C. 1620, to
Sept. 24, B. C.
1584.

(Generation VI, reign of Manetho viii, of the monumental lists viii.) *Amen-hotep III.*, *Ra-neb-ma*, son of Thothmes IV. by a queen, *Maut em shoi*, whom some suppose to have been of Asiatic origin; and they would account from hence for a certain peculiarity of features which appears in Amenoph III. and his successors down to Horus inclusively. That *Taia*, the queen of Amenoph himself, was of Asiatic origin is less doubtful, as she appears with him on a scarabæus of his 11th year worshipping the sun's disk, a devotion not indigenous in Egypt; and she is specially honoured on the monuments of the sun-worshippers who after the death of Amenoph ruled Egypt; so that one may collect that they were Egyptians only by half-blood, if at all, and that it was through Taia that they claimed the crown. That some unpopularity attached to his memory afterwards (unless indeed Egypt was violently over-run, as Manetho says it was, by foreign enemies), is rendered probable by the fact, that his tomb has been most carefully defaced; and that his temple-palace, to the approaches of which the colossus called Memnon and its fellow belonged, has been completely destroyed. His 36th year being marked on the monuments, we must suppose him to have reigned 35 years and 10 months at least, instead of the 30 and 10 months of the lists; and his reign may be placed conjecturally between May 1, B. C. 1619, and Feb. 20, B. C. 1583, 6 years after the death of Joshua. But in technical reckoning he will have 36 years, reaching from Oct. 3, B. C. 1620, to Sept. 24, B. C. 1584, and he will leave 5 months *to be reckoned* to his successor.

5. Sept. 20,
B. C. 1558, to
Sept. 19, B. C.
1563?

(Generation VII, not in Manetho, nor in the monumental lists.) *Amon-anchut*, *Ra-neb-cheperu*, said to have been a son of Amenoph III. who certainly reigned before Horus; and as he is omitted by Manetho, while Horus another son of Amenoph III., with a long reign, is made to follow imme-

diately after his father, we may infer that the years of Amon-anchut (whose 4th current year is found) are included within the reign of Horus in the lists. The fact, however, that the foreign dependencies of Egypt and their tributes continued unchanged during his reign looks rather as if he came *before* the sun-worshippers.

(Generation VII, not in Manetho, nor in the monumen-
tal lists.) The sun-worshipping king *Quash-an [Ra]-athin*,
whether he followed, or as is more commonly thought pre-
ceded Amon-anchut, certainly had a reign of some length,
as the sculptured tombs at Tel-el-Amarna attest; and not
only his 6th and 8th year but his 12th is said to have been
found. Lepsius asserts that he also was a son of Amenoph
III.; and, if so, no doubt his mother was *Taia*, whose pecu-
liar worship of the sun's disk he undertook to establish in
Egypt, while he defaced the effigies of the god Ammon and
the names in which Ammon entered into composition. It is
said that he had himself taken at first the names "*Amenhotep
IV., Ra-nefer-cheperu*," and that afterwards he defaced his
own scutcheons, and cut in over *one* of them a new name,
viz., *Chouen-Atin* or *Chouen-Atin-ra*. But if we take the
narrative of Manetho only for our guide (and there is little
doubt that under his impious Hierosolymite Shepherds the
sun-worshippers who ruled Egypt after Amenoph III. are
meant), we shall rather conjecture that Quashan was an
Asiatic of the same country and religion and kindred with
Taia, than that he was her son by Amenoph III. (though it is
true that he honours Amenoph III., and even Thothmes IV.,
on his monuments as well as *Taia*). And if he were also the
son of an Egyptian princess, or had married a daughter of
Amenoph III. and *Taia*, he may have set up a claim to the
throne of Egypt on the death of his father-in-law, and may
have enforced it by a successful invasion. Manetho himself
suggests the idea that the invaders had a party in Egypt
with which they were not unconnected by blood. Other in-
dications, besides those that have been already mentioned,
look the same way. A local king of Thebes named *Ai*, with
the throne name *Ra-cheper-cheperu-iri-ma*, whose tomb has

16. Sept. 24,
B.C. 1581, to
Sept. 20, B.C.
1568.

been most completely defaced at some time after his death, appears in the suite of Quashan as his subordinate; and while the other foreign dependencies of Egypt and their tributes remain in his time unaltered, *Mesopotamia*, as it is said, is *not* named in the list as a tributary country, but Egypt itself *is*. If we take instead of 13 years given in Manetho's narrative to the impious Asiatics the 15 full years reckoned from Thoth 1 to Thoth 1, prefixed by him to the head of his Dyn. XIX, and reinsert them in their proper place, so as to follow after the death of Amenoph III. (unless Amon-anchut can be shown to come first), it will be *necessary* either to destroy of ourselves that character of full years which Manetho has given them, or to add to them such odd months as are wanting to fill the interval between the death of Amenoph III., Feb. 20, B.C. 1583, and Thoth 1, that is, Sept. 24, next following. Thus we shall have to add 7 months, 3 months more than the compensation we wanted to find room for; this excess showing perhaps that the Theban reign of Amosis began really not 4 but 7 months earlier than Nov. 4, B. C. 1748, or else giving us a fraction of 3 months overrunning (as was to be expected) the end of the dynasty, and covered in the Chronicle by the first year of Dyn. XIX as technically antedated. For convenience sake we shall proceed as if the latter were the case. Thus the actual reign of the sun-worshippers, having 15 full years and 7 months, will begin from Feb. 20, B. C. 1583 (nearly 6 years after the death of Joshua), and will end nearly with the Egyptian year at Sept. 20, B. C. 1568 (in the 4th year after the commencement of Othniel's judgeship). But in technical reckoning they will have 16 years, from Sept. 24, B. C. 1584, to Sept. 20, B. C. 1568. It is plainly unlikely that the actual reign of the sun-worshipping king, suppressed by Manetho, should have lasted just 15 years to a day, and doubly so that it should have begun and ended with the Egyptian year; just as it was unlikely that the apparent parallelism of the sum of Manetho's actual reigns for his Dynasties XVIII and XIX with that of XVIII and XIX of the Chronicle should be true and chronological. But there is no great improbability in supposing an actual reign, like that of Horus, following

after times of servitude or usurpation, to have been dated originally from the new year.

This is the place for noticing another method which might have been pursued. If, for instance, after showing that Manetho's two Dynasties XVIII and XIX of actual reigns could not well lie concurrently with Dynasties XVIII and XIX of the Chronicle between Thoth 1, B.C. 1748, and Thoth 1, B.C. 1206,—and further that the actual reign of Amosis was probably reckoned by Manetho from an earlier and the technical reign of the same king by the Chronicle from a later accession, we had abstained from attempting to estimate the precise number of months by which his coronation at Memphis was later than Thoth 1 in B.C. 1748, and had drawn out the chronology of the dynasty at first tentatively upon Manetho's own suggestion, *as if* its years were coincident with those of the Chronicle, though that might in fact be untrue, reckoning upon this principle we should have made the reign of Amenoph III. end not at Feb. 20, B.C. 1583, but 4 months later, that is at June 20 in the same year. We should then have had to place the 15 years prefixed by Manetho to his Dyn. XIX; and as these in his series are full years coincident with as many of the Chronicle, running from Thoth 1 to Thoth 1, they could not have joined on to the preceding reigns at June 20 in B.C. 1583, but would have required 3 months to be prefixed to them; and this done, they would be technically antedated from Thoth 1 preceding the death of Amenoph, and would count for the Chronicle as 16 full years. Again, after the end of the 15 full years, i. e. after Thoth 1 = Sept. 23, B.C. 1568, instead of reaching only to the accession of Horus, calculated upwards from the end of the dynasty, viz., from Thoth 1 = Aug. 9, B.C. 1400 (for from Aug. 9, B.C. 1400, 168 years and 3 months take us up to June 20, B.C. 1568), we should have overrun his accession by 3 months. To avoid this we must either have displaced and thrust down everything below to the extent of 3 months, while we kept all above unchanged, or we must have made a second addition to the 15 full years of the sun-worshippers by suffixing to them 9 more odd months. Thus only could they both

retain their original character of *full years lying between Thoth 1 and Thoth 1*, and also coalesce with the 179 years and 9 months of the dynasty above, and the 168 years and 3 months below, without unequally disturbing the relative position of any years or months on either side. But the result of the whole process (besides that the sun-worshippers instead of 15 years would have 16, which is not improbable) would be this, that we should have for the whole dynasty not 348 but 349 years, lying still with the same improbability as before between Thoth 1 and Thoth 1, but also (which is an impossibility) lying chronologically within Thoth 1 = Nov. 4, B.C. 1748, and Thoth 1 = Aug. 9, B.C. 1400. Those two fractions then which we have supposed to be inserted in the middle at Manetho's own suggestion, would force out each of them a fraction equal to itself one at either end; and we should have 3 months forced up and projecting above the chronological head of the dynasty, and 9 months forced down and overrunning below its chronological end. The consequence would be that all the dates above Thoth 1 = Sept. 24 in B.C. 1583 would be one Egyptian month later than we have now fixed them; the death of Thothmes III., for instance, would be at Dec. 11, instead of Nov. 11 in B.C. 1565, only 4 months perhaps instead of 5 before the Exodus (though an interval of 5 months was not at all too much), but all dates below the accession of Horus (which would be at March 19, B.C. 1567) would be 9 months lower than we shall have to place them according to our own calculation of the probable date of the coronation of Amosis at Memphis. But it is time to return from this digression.

31. Sept. 20,
B.C. 1568, to
Sept. 12, B.C.
1567.

(Generation VII, reign of Manetho IX, and of the monumental lists IX.) *Hor-em-hebi*, *Meri-amon*, *Ra-tsaser-cheperu*, *Sotep-en-ra*, son of Amenoph III. The remains of his pylon at Karnak described by M. Prisse are important as proving that his actual reign was later both than that of the sun-worshipping king Quashan, and than that of Amon-anchut, blocks from buildings erected by them with their sculptures and cartouches turned inwards having been used as materials in its walls. In like manner the fact that the sun-worshipper Quashan has appropriated in some cases the cartouches of

Amenoph III. demonstrates him to have been later than that king. Amon-anchut being omitted by Manetho and also by the monumental lists, and Horus being made to follow immediately after his father Amenoph III., there is no reason to doubt that the 36 years and 5 months given to Horus in the lists are antedated so as to cover the whole reign of Amon-anchut, if Amon-anchut was his immediate predecessor, whether it had only the 4 years current required by the date found or any longer continuance. That his nominal reign in the lists includes also the 15 years and 7 months of the sun-worshippers and the last 5 years cut off from the life of Amenoph III., is an idea in itself by no means inadmissible. It is certainly presented by Manetho as doing so, and the monuments oppose no difficulty, as no date beyond his 9th year has been found; and even after deducting ($5 + 16 + 4 =$) 25 years, there would still remain 10 years and 5 months for his actual reign. But whatever may be the truth historically, since Manetho's lists give no more years than the precise number required for the chronology of the dynasty, we cannot afford to suppress any years of the lists, but must reckon them all as chronological until they are actually displaced by others recorded on the monuments but omitted by Manetho, and requiring to be reinserted. So the 5 years cut off from Amenoph III., having been discovered by help of the monuments, necessarily displace 5 years from some place or other in the lists; and at no place can the compensating suppression be made with more probability than at the end of the nominal reign of Horus. But this reign cannot be supposed to be antedated so as to include at its head the last 5 years of the life of Amenoph III. (together with the 16 following years reckoned technically to the sun-worshippers) until we have at first ascertained the existence of a suppression of 15 years and 7 months elsewhere. Meantime the idea that the nominal reign of Horus may really include in part at least the time of the sun-worshippers (whom Amon-anchut may possibly have preceded) is favoured by a recent discovery in the Serapeum at Memphis; an Apis-tomb, connected by an inscription with the name of Horus, having been found, in which, instead of the usual mummy

in a sarcophagus, only some burnt bones of a bull had been deposited, wrapped up together in muslin. The chamber besides showed signs of haste, secrecy, and poverty accompanying the burial. And the adjoining tomb of the preceding Apis seemed to have been purposely destroyed; so that there may possibly be here some confirmation of Manetho's story that the impious "Hierosolymites" not only forced the priests of Apis themselves to slay or sacrifice him, but afterwards roasted and ate him. But to leave these questions:— If we cut off from the reign of Horus the 5 years which have been restored to his father above, it will then have 31 years and 5 months, including at their head probably 5 years actually belonging either to Amon-anchut or to the sun-worshippers; and these 31 years and 5 months, beginning at Sept. 23, B.C. 1568, will end Feb. 9, B.C. 1536. But in technical reckoning the reign will have 31 years from Sept. 23, B.C. 1568, to Sept. 12, B.C. 1537.

For the interval between Horus and Ramessou, or Rameses I., the Armeses or Armais, probably, of the lists, an interval, according to the same lists, of 49 years and 9 months, the monuments have hitherto afforded nothing but a single name of one king, and that illegible, found by M. Mariette in the Serapeum at Memphis. But according to Manetho's lists there should be four reigns, as follows:—

13. Sept. 12, B.C. 1537, to Sept. 9, B.C. 1525. (Generation VIII, reign of Manetho x, not in the monumental lists.) *Achenchres*, daughter (i.e. of Horus), 12 years 1 month, as if from Feb. 9, B.C. 1536, to March 8, B.C. 1524. In technical reckoning 12 years, from Sept. 12, B.C. 1537, to Sept. 9, B.C. 1525.

9. Sept. 9, B.C. 1525, to Sept. 7, B.C. 1516. (Generation VIII, reign of Manetho xi, not in the monumental lists.) *Rathotis*, her brother, 9 years; as if from March 8, B.C. 1524, to March 6, B.C. 1516; or in technical reckoning 9 years, from Sept. 9, B.C. 1525, to Sept. 7, B.C. 1516. (Perhaps the king whose name has been found in the Serapeum.)

12. Sept. 7, B.C. 1516, to Sept. 4, B.C. 1504. (Generation IX, reign of Manetho xii, not in the monumental lists.) *Achencheres I.*, 12 years 5 months, as if from March 5, B.C. 1515, to Aug. 1, B.C. 1503; or technically, 12 years from Sept. 7, B.C. 1516, to Sept. 4, B.C. 1504.

(Generation ix, reign of Manetho xiii, not in the monumental lists.) *Achencheres II.*, 12 years 3 months, as if from Aug. 1, B.C. 1503, to Oct. 31, B.C. 1491; or technically 13 years, from Sept. 4, B.C. 1504, to Sept. 1, B.C. 1491.

(Generation x, reign of Manetho xiv, of the monumental lists x.) *Ramessou, Ra-men-peh*, commonly called *Rameses I.* His mother's name is said to be *Tii*, which some have read *Titi*, and sought to identify with *Rathotis* of the lists. Again, she is identified with the wife of *Ai*, the local king of Thebes, and vassal of Quashan. She is also said by some to have been the daughter, and it is considerably added "the youngest daughter," of *Amenoph III.* Thus *Rameses I.* is made to be grandson of *Amenoph III.*, the grandfather having had a reign of at least 35 years and 10 months, and the grandson succeeding to the throne ($16 + 31.5^m + 12.1^m + 9 + 12.5^m + 12.3^m =$) 93 years and 2 months after his death. The lists and notices of Manetho, on the contrary, interpose at least three generations, of *Horus*, *Rathotis*, and *Achencheres* (for the two kings named *Achencheres*, even if two persons, are not likely to be *two* distinct generations) between *Amenoph III.* and *Rameses I.* His name we have identified in the lists of Manetho with *Armesses* or *Armais*, which, like *Ramessou* itself, *Rampses*, and *Rapsakes*, is only a Greek variant for *Rameses*. His 2nd year has been found; and if he reigned the 4 years and 1 month given him in the lists, they will reach from Oct. 31, B.C. 1491, to Nov. 29, B.C. 1487. In technical reckoning he will have 4 years, beginning from Sept. 1, B.C. 1491, and reaching to Aug. 31, B.C. 1487.

(Generation xi, reign of Manetho xv, of the monumental lists xi.) *Seti I., Mi-amon*, or *Merien-amon, Merienphtha; Ra-en-ma*. He "defeated the Shasou (i.e. *Shepherds*) even to the wretched land of *Kanāna*;" and, accompanied by his son, he extended his conquests to *Mesopotamia*. He founded the palace-temple of *Gourneh*, and the great hall at *Karnak*, which were both finished by his son. His 1st year only is found marked, at *Speos Artemidos* in the *Heptanomis*. He seems to be often confounded with his son, the glory of conquest and the name *Mi-amon* being com-

mon to them both. And perhaps his son was associated with him almost from the beginning. The single year and four months given him in the lists under the name of Rameses, as if *he* were the Σέθως ὁ καὶ Ῥαμεσσῆς of Manetho's fabling narrative, will reach from Nov. 29, B.C. 1487, to March 28, B.C. 1485 (or technically from Aug. 31, B.C. 1487, to Aug. 30, B.C. 1486), and this one year may be the time that he reigned alone; for it is difficult to think that his whole reign was really so short. His tomb alone, which is most gorgeous, and worthy of a long reign like that of his son, is a strong sign to the contrary.

65. Aug. 30,
B.C. 1486, to
Aug. 14, B.C.
1480.

(Generations XII and XIII, reign of Manetho xvi, of the monumental lists xii.) *Rameses II. Mi-amon, Ra-tseser-ma*, with *and* without the adjunct *So-tep-en-ra*, which gave occasion to Rosellini to divide him into two kings, whom he calls Rameses II. and Rameses III. The 62nd of Rameses II. has been found on his monuments, which are extremely numerous, and of great magnificence. On them his conquests both in inner Africa and in Asia are represented with much detail. The colossus of "Sesostris" seen by Herodotus at Memphis, and the stelæ at the river Lycus (El Kab), in Phœnicia, both still visible, bear his names. (The colossus has both the ordinary throne-name and the variant.) It is Rameses II. who is often called the Great.

A date on some fragments of a calendar from Elephantine, now in the Louvre, found mixed with other fragments bearing the name of Thothmes III., but by the style of sculpture belonging rather to the age of Rameses II., at least in the opinion of M. Brugsch, gives the heliacal rising of Sirius so as to indicate according to M. Biot for the latitude of Elephantine the year B.C. 1444. Now this year cannot possibly belong to the reign of Thothmes III.; but it ought to be the 43rd year of Rameses II., whose 66 years and 2 months seem to lie between March 28, B.C. 1485, and May 11, B.C. 1419. In technical reckoning he would have 66 years, from Aug. 30, B.C. 1486, to Aug. 14, B.C. 1420. His eldest son *Scha-em Djam*, who was viceroy of Memphis, being known to have died before his father, who was succeeded by the thirteenth of his numerous sons, Merienphtha,

the only one of them all who reigned after him, and the reign itself amounting in length to two full life-generations, one may suppose that the author of the Chronicle would reckon this as a double generation, the sons who died before their father being in strictness his Generation XIII; though it would come to the same thing if Thothmes II. and Hatasu above were reckoned as Generation III, Thothmes III., though brother to Hatasu, being counted separately for Generation IV. So the *fourteen* generations of the Chronicle would be identical with the *thirteen* names of kings which appear in the monumental lists.

(Generation XIV, reign of Manetho xvi, of the monumental lists xiii.) *Meri-en-phtha*, *Bai-en-ra*, thirteenth of the sons of Rameses II. His 4th year has been found. His 19 years and 6 months should lie between May 11, B.C. 1419, and Nov. 7, B.C. 1400, so ending 3 months after Aug. 9, then the end of the Egyptian year. But as technically reckoned by the author of the Chronicle *Meri-en-phtha* would have 20 years from Aug. 14, B.C. 1420, to Aug. 9, B.C. 1400, and the overrunning fraction of 3 months would be included within the first year (technically antedated) of the following dynasty.

20. Aug. 14,
B.C. 1820, to
Aug. 9, B.C.
1400.

But the XVI reigns of Manetho, at the ordinary average of $24\frac{1}{2}$ years, should give 392 years for the dynasty; and even consolidated as the Chronicle consolidates them into XIV of its *generations*, they should give 343 years. So then the 348 years of the Chronicle are justified rather than 333, which is the *apparent* sum of Manetho.

The Diospolite Dynasties XIX and XX of Manetho's lists, with VII kings in 194 years, (15 of his *apparent* sum of 209 having been restored to Dyn. XVIII,) and XII kings in 135 years respectively, if thrown together make a sum of XIX kings in 329 years; while the same dynasties in the Chronicle, with V generations in 194, and VIII in 228 years, make a total of XIII generations in 422 years.

Dyn. XIX.
viii Diospo-
lites. 194 yrs.
from Aug. 9,
B.C. 1400, to
June 21, B.C.
1206.

But XIX Diospolite kings admitted by Manetho himself to have existed, (and not fewer than XXIII actual kings appear at Thebes on the monuments, before we come to the Tanite-Bubastite name Shishonk,) have an average in 329

years of only 17 years and about 4 months each, while with the 422 years of the Chronicle they have 22 years each, which is still $2\frac{1}{4}$ years under the ordinary average. So the chronology of the Chronicle is implied to be the true rather than his own by Manetho's own lists. And much more does this appear, if we take the two dynasties separately. For the Chronicle having for Dyn. XIX only v *generations* in 194 years, with an average of 39 years nearly to each generation, Manetho, making only one or at most two more actual *reigns* than the Chronicle makes *generations*, has still an average of $27\frac{1}{4}$ years to each; while in his Dyn. XX, twelve reigns in 135 years have an average of only 11 years and 3 months each, which is clearly inadmissible. For Dyn. XIX the names of the monuments may be compared with the v generations of the Chronicle and the vii reigns of Manetho thus:—

First, after Meri-en-phthah II., the last king of Dyn. XVIII, there appears (on particular monuments only, but not in the monumental lists),

(Actual reign i.) *Ra-men-ka Sotepenra*; *Amonmeses Hak-Djam*.—In an inscription at Gourneh he is said to have been “bred by Isis, in the city of *Khev* (Aphroditopolis), to reign over all beneath the sun.” Lepsius thinks his name has been supplanted at Gourneh by that of Siphthah (though *he* also is from the same city of *Khev*). His name, and the fact that he is suppressed as illegitimate, favours the idea that he is the source of the *Armais* or *Danaus* of Manetho, whose 8 years seem in the lists of *Africanus* to be deducted from the 59 given to *Sethos* by Manetho according to *Josephus*, as if they were covered by the last reign of Dyn. XVIII.

(Actual reign ii.) *Khou-Ra-Sotepenra*: *Siphthah-Meri-en-phthah II.* His queen *Ta-tsesser* takes precedence of him in their joint tomb; so perhaps she was a daughter of Meri-en-phthah I. On his standard he has the title “Risen in *Khev*,” and a dignitary named *Bai* boasts of having “established him on the throne of his father.” These two kings being suppressed, we come to the king who stands seventh in the series of nine at *Medinet Habou*, viz. :

(Generation i of the Chronicle; reigns or *names* of Manetho i and ii, and of the monumental lists i; actual reign

iii.) *Seti Meri-en-phtha, Ra-tseser-cheperu, Meri-amon*, son of Meri-en-phtha I., and grandson of Rameses the Great. He seems to have thought of appropriating the tomb of Merienphthah II. Siphthah; but afterwards he made a tomb for himself. He should be the original of that "Sethos son of Amenophis" who took refuge as a child when only five years old in Ethiopia. Afterwards perhaps, under Siphthah, he obtained the title of Prince of Kush; for a prince Seti appears under Siphthah with this title, and with that of "Fan-bearer." The romance of the "Two Brothers," translated by M. De Rougé, was written for the same Prince Seti.

59. Aug. 9,
B.C. 1400, to
July 25, B.C.
1341.

(Generation II of the Chronicle, *name* of Manetho iv, of Medinet Habou viii., i. e. 2d of the dynasty; actual reign iv.) *Set-necht* or *Nechtset*, and *Amon-necht*; *Ra-tseser Schau-Meri-amon*; probably son of Seti II., and so the second generation of the Chronicle; but apparently consolidated by Manetho with his father and his son into one reign under the double name of "Σέθως, ὁ καὶ Παμεσσῆς." This king has appropriated the tomb of Siphthah-Merienphthah II. and Ta-tseser; but he appears together with Rameses III. (his son) receiving homage from an umbrella-bearer named Hora; and the title taken by Rameses III. in the same sculpture, "Hak On," may have been given him in his father's lifetime.

66 yrs. begin
from accesa-
sion of Set-
necht, July
25, B.C. 1341,

(Generation III of the Chronicle, *name* of Manetho i and ii; of series at Medinet Habou ninth and last, i. e. 3d of this dynasty; actual reign v.) *Rameses III., Hak-On*; *Ra-tseser-ma, Meri-amon*. He was probably son of the preceding, and certainly son of a king; for he says to Ammon, "I am established on the throne of my father, as thou didst establish Horus on the throne of his father Osiris. . . . I have not usurped the place of another." (*MS. of Mr. Harris*, quoted by M. De Rougé.) Though he clearly is the king spoken of in Manetho's myth as "having *fleets* as well as armies and cavalry," and extending his conquests towards the East, he has no such name as "Sethos," to say nothing of Ægyptus, nor any brother "Armais." Still less is he the head of Dyn. XIX. So we must look for the source of "Armaus" either in the Armesses of the list of Africanus

and end at
the death of
Rameses III.
July 9, B.C.
1275. (His ac-
cession, after
20 of Setnecht,
at July 20, B.C.
1320 ?)

preceding the place in Dyn. XVIII where Seti I. Meriamon, or Mi-amon, and his son Rameses II. Miamon, are misnamed or dropped out (and this is the view which best suited Eusebius; and it may be true notwithstanding that it suited him); or we must resolve the myth into its separate elements, and suppose the story of the two brothers or cousins to belong partly to Amon-meses and Seti II. at the head of Dyn. XIX (though Seti II. was no great conqueror), and partly to the conqueror Rameses II., blended with Seti I. and II., and with Rameses III. From the paintings in the palace-temple of the last of these kings at Medinet Habou, executed after, but probably not long after, his 12th year, it seems that the epoch of the Sothic Cycle, when the heliacal rising of Sirius, July 20, coincided with the first day of the moveable Thoth, was connected with his reign. This, if calculated for the latitude of Memphis, or thereabouts, would indicate July 20 in the year B. C. 1322; and when the Sothic Cycle is mentioned by later writers this is the year always understood: but by actual observation at *Thebes* the year, according to M. Biot, would be B. C. 1300 [or 1302]. And Herodotus speaking in part of that Rameses-Sesostris who was nearest to his own time, and who had the *fleet*, and so was said to have crossed into Thrace, puts his accession "less than 900 years before his own time;" that is, some time later than B. C. 1350. So it seems that Manetho has done with Sethos II. the head of his Dyn. XIX much as he has done with Amosis, the head of his Dyn. XVIII, making of him a fabulous personage, with names and acts which do not all belong to any one king in that place, but partly to Sethos I. and Rameses II. many years above, and partly to Rameses III. many years below. The 26th year of Rameses III. has been found on the monuments, the Apis-bull numbered 15 by M. Mariette having died in that year, while his Apis No. 9 died in the 55th year of Rameses II. Miamon. And supposing him to be intended by "Rapsakes" the second king of Manetho's list, the $(59 + 66 =)$ 125 years given to the first two reigns of the dynasty would take us from B. C. 1400, the head of Dyn. XIX, to B. C. 1275; or, if 8 were deducted as belonging to the usurpation of "Armaus or Danaus," to

B. C. 1283, so as to cover the actual Theban as well as the Memphite coincidence of the movable new year with the heliacal rising of Sirius. At Medinet Habou one sees on the wall a series of ten sons of Rameses III. sculptured with their names; and the names of the *eldest four* have been inclosed afterwards in royal rings, showing that they reigned after their father. This makes one suspect that the words following the *first* name "Sethos" in Manetho, "after whom the eldest of his sons, Rapsakes, reigned 66 years," originated in the fact that after the *third* legitimate king and generation, Rameses III., the *four* "eldest of his ten sons" (with even a fifth perhaps, not one of the eldest, included) reigned successively, who all having the same family name, and all being of one and the same generation, might be consolidated into one reign. But the 66 years given to Rapsakes (according to Josephus) with the 59 of Sethos, ὁ καὶ Ῥαμессῆς, preceding may be supposed to cover the *actual* reigns over against which they stand.

(Generation IV of the Chronicle, reign or *name* of Manetho iii, actual reign vi.) *Rameses IV., Hik-ma-Miamon: Ra-tsesser-ma, Sotep-en-Amon*; the first of the ten sons of Rameses III. at Medinet Habou. In his 2nd year "the Rotennu prostrating themselves bring their tributes, and all the Aamu tremble before him." He founded a fortress at Hammamat to secure the commerce of the Red Sea. A variant of the name of this king, according to Lepsius, with his third year marked, appears also at Hammamat (whom we shall call Rameses IV. *bis*); and connected with the same Rameses IV. *bis* is a high-priest of Ammon named Rameses Nechtu, son of Meri-Bast, Prefect of the Palace and Director of Public Works, whose son Amenhotep appears as high-priest under Rameses IX. of Lepsius, the last king, if Rameses IV. *bis* is only a variant, of this dynasty. But M. de Rougé thinks that he is a separate king; and if so, he must have reigned next after the sons of Rameses III., making the fifth generation of the Chronicle, and leaving no room in the dynasty for any other later reign, unless it were of such a kind as not to make a separate generation. But, until further discoveries decide the question, we may treat Rameses IX. of M. de

Five sons of
Rameses III.
62 years, be-
ginning from
July 9, B. C.
1275.

Rougé, i. e. *Rameses Mati* or *Mama Meriamon*, *Ra-hik-ma Sotepenamon*, as being only a variant of Rameses IV. And unless this is so indeed, the tomb of the eldest son of Rameses III. is hitherto unknown.

(Generation IV of the Chronicle, name v of Manetho ? actual reign vii.) *Rameses V.*, *Amen-ha-chopeschf Meriamon* ; *Ra-tsesser-ma Se-cheper-en-ra*. His cartouches having been supplanted by those of Rameses VI. (second of the four elder sons of Rameses III.) at Biban Moluk, he must be inserted here ; and his name being the same with that of the eighth son of Rameses III., he may perhaps have taken advantage of the minority of a nephew or niece, who never reigned, to occupy the throne. *If so*, the rings about the names of the eldest four sons of Rameses III. at Medinet Habou were not added there one by one, as each brother succeeded to the throne, but at some time *after this reign of Rameses V.*, which was disregarded as illegitimate. It is celebrated, however, in an inscription at Silsilis for abundance and good order.

(Generation IV of the Chronicle, name iii of Manetho, actual reign viii.) *Rameses VI.* *Amon-ha-chopeschf Neter-hak-On* ; *Ra-neb-ma Miamon* ; second of the ten sons of Rameses III. at Medinet Habou. He has left a fine tomb, perhaps the most complete of all, with astronomical paintings. These exhibit the heliacal rising of Sirius at the end of the night of Thoth 15, i. e. 15 days later than in the palace of Rameses III. at Medinet Habou. And this indicates that 60 years had already passed from B.C. 1322, if it had been at Memphis ; but from B.C. 1300 or 1302, more probably, in fact, as these paintings were executed at Thebes. So towards the end of the reign of the second son of Rameses III. we should be already at the year 1240 B.C. Apis No. 16 of M. Mariette died under Rameses VI., his preceding Apis, No. 15, having died under Rameses III.

(Generation IV of the Chronicle, name of Manetho iii, actual reign ix.) *Rameses VII.* *At-amen(?) Neter-hak-On* ; *Ra-tsesser-ma Miamon Sotepenra* ; third of the ten sons of Rameses III. who appear together at Medinet Habou.

The 52 years (Generation IV of the Chronicle, name of Manetho iii,

actual reign x.) *Rameses VIII. Seti-chopeschf Miamon*; end at his death, June 26, B.C. 1223.
Ra-tsaser-ma Khou-en-Amen; fourth of the ten sons of Rameses III. This and the four preceding reigns make up together the *fourth* of the five *generations* of the Chronicle; and this king should be at least the *fifth* of Manetho's seven, if he made two out of the five sons of Rameses III., or only the fourth perhaps, if he gave only six distinct reigns.

(Generation v of the Chronicle, name of Manetho vii, 7. June 26, B.C. 1223, to June 24, B.C. 1216.) *Rameses IX.* [XI. of Lepsius, X. of De Rougé] *Siphthah Se-scha-en-ra Miamon*; discovered by M. Mariette in the tomb of his Apis No. 17, on an open vase found in that tomb inclosing a second similar but smaller vase, also open, with the name of *Rameses Scha-em Djam* (Rameses IX. of Lepsius). Hence, if the vases had only been found closed and covered, it might perhaps have been collected that this Siphthah II. was the immediate *successor* of Scha-em Djam, who might have died during the 72 days of the Apis obsequies; the preceding Apis, No. 16 of M. Mariette, having died under Rameses VI. But after the Apis No. 17, whose tomb unites the two kings Siphthah and Scha-em Djam, the next following Apis, No. 18, is buried by Scha-em Djam alone, so that he and not Siphthah must have been the successor, *or at least the survivor*; and the two, who may have been co-regnants, may be presumed in any case to have constituted together only one generation, the fifth and last of the Chronicle. The high-priest Amenhotep, who appears as contemporary of Scha-em Djam, being son of another high-priest Rameses Nechtu occurring under Rameses IV., the reign of Scha-em Djam is already at as wide an interval after Rameses IV. as is convenient. And lastly, while Manetho's number of six kings, not to say seven, seems to need two to follow after the sons of Rameses III., and he has actually two short reigns at the end of his dynasty, Siphthah to all appearance reigned only a short time, and might readily coalesce with his successor so as to make only one generation for the Chronicle, while his reign of 5 or 7 years is scarcely enough alone to bring us on to B.C. 1206 from the death of the last survivor of the sons of Rameses III., even though it be true that when the tomb of

Rameses VI. was painting, 60 years had already elapsed from B.C. 1302. On putting these considerations together, it may seem probable that after the sons of Rameses III. had reigned, from B.C. 1275, 52 years at the most, to B.C. 1223 (this number results after the suppression of the 28 years which we had to suppress), Siphthah and Scha-em Djam followed,—Siphthah, who should be the younger of the two, being co-regnant with Scha-em-Djam for 5 or 7 years, and Scha-em-Djam surviving for 12 years instead of the 7 given by Manetho. The five years which have certainly dropped out from some one reign or other in the list of Africanus, are thus conjecturally restored by us to this last reign of the dynasty. This may well seem more probable that that Siphthah alone had a reign of much more than 5 or 7 or 12 years, and concluded the dynasty. But it is to future discoveries alone that we must look for a solution of the question. [Since the above was written, the author has been informed by Mr. Birch that a date late in the 16th year of Scha-em-Djam has been found mentioned in a hieratic papyrus belonging to Mde. D'Orbiney.]

17. June 26,
B.C. 1223, to
June 1, B.C.
1206.

(Generation v of the Chronicle, name of Manetho vi, actual reign xi or xii.) *Rameses X.*, *Scha-em-Djam Merer-Amon*; *Neferkaura Sotepenra* (XI. of De Rougé, IX. of Lepsius). "Lepsius," says M. de Rougé, "improperly puts under him *both* the high-priest Amenhotep, and his father the high-priest Rameses Nechtu, son of Meri-Bast, who was really contemporary with Rameses Mati, or Mama, Miamon (the Rameses IV. *bis* of Lepsius, but Rameses IX. of M. de Rougé).

Whatever becomes of Rameses IX. of M. de Rougé, the *fifth* and last generation of the Chronicle, which follows next after that of the sons of Rameses III., must include the last two reigns and *names* of Manetho. And having for these two reigns two monumental names inseparably connected together, and connected also through the high-priest Amenhotep and his father with the reign of Rameses IV., the only question is, which of the two, Siphthah or Scha-em-Djam, is to be put first? and how are the 17 years of Manetho's last two kings (5 + 5 dropped out + 7, making 17)

to be apportioned between them? On the one hand, the synchronism of Thouoris or Polybus, Manetho's last name, and Troy, plainly indicates that neither the place of that king as the last of the dynasty, nor probably the length of his reign, differ from those really given him by Manetho: on the other, the monuments prove that, of the two kings, one, whose reign certainly exceeded the 7 years of Thouoris, no less certainly survived the other. For it appears from the discoveries of M. Mariette in 1853 not only that Scha-em-Djam, who was found conjoined with Siphthah in one Apis-tomb, buried another later Apis, No. 18, alone, but also that he erected at Memphis monolith columns 40 feet high, with immense architraves bearing his names, works which seem to imply a reign of some length. In his own tomb he boasts of his victories, and a scribe attests that "all the peoples of the North are his subjects." But what is most important is this, that in the same tomb there is an astronomical painting resembling that of the tomb of Rameses VI.; and the indications of the rising of Sothis and other stars being the same in both, this proves that the interval of time between the two was less than 60 years. For in those paintings, the risings of the stars being noted only for the beginning of the morning of the first, and the end of the night of the fifteenth day of each month, no change would be made (according to M. Biot's explanation) till the difference in the risings of the stars amounted to 15 days, which would be only after an interval of 60 years.

So then we are precluded on several grounds from widening the interval between Rameses VI. and Scha-em-Djam, or supposing the latter to have belonged to the following Dynasty XX; and yet, of the two kings found conjoined, Siphthah, who *cannot stand last*, rather than Scha-em-Djam, must be Thouoris who *does stand last* in Manetho's dynasty. Manetho then, it would seem, in this instance as in others was regardless of true chronology, and the synchronism connected with the reign of Thouoris, and probably even the name itself, belongs only to the *apparent* chronology of his lists. And, this being understood, there is no difficulty in explaining how Thouoris or Siphthah, with his short reign of

seven years, may have come to be placed after another king seemingly his successor but of the same generation, perhaps a brother, who survived him, and had much the longer reign of the two. It is only necessary to suppose that the two were colleagues in the throne during the whole reign of the elder, or during some part of it, and that the elder, whose name would naturally be put first, outlived the younger. But the last two reigns of Manetho, having together ($5 + 7 =$) 12, or rather 17 years, (if we are right in restoring to *them* those other 5 which have dropped out, and which are required by the sum of his dynasty,) take us from B.C. 1223 to B.C. 1206; and so the kings placed between Rameses VI. and Scha-em-Djam inclusively would not seem to require an interval between the paintings in the two tombs of more than 60 years. Lastly, the date in the D'Orbiney papyrus enables us to confirm the conjecture that Scha-em-Djam reigned the whole of those 17 years which in Manetho's lists belonged seemingly to the last two names; and, consequently, that the 7 years placed last do not belong chronologically to the king meant by Thouoris at all, but to the name Ammenemes preceding, from which they are detached only to indicate the length of the shorter and concurrent reign. But as regards the apparent chronology and the synchronism of Thouoris (whose reign seems to begin in B.C. 1213) with Troy, this synchronism, as asserted, must be understood to attach to the 7th or 6th year preceding the death of Scha-em-Djam and the end of Dyn. XIX. It is remarkable that Dicaearchus also, who wrote perhaps about B.C. 322, puts Phrouron, or Nilus, 436 years above the first Olympiad, that is, at B.C. ($776 + 436 =$) 1212, while his Sesonchosis = Sesostriis, is put 2500 years higher than Nilus as the *first king and conqueror* after Horus. Sesostriis so would be put, according to Manetho's scheme of 3555 years of kings, at the 178th year *after* Menes; but according to the scheme of Ptolemy of Mendes and Africanus, if we go up 2500 years from Thouoris and Troy, we shall find the place of this Sesostriis 1318 years below Menes at the 25th year of Papi-Maire, the predecessor of Sesortasen I., which last was really the earliest Egyptian conqueror. But for Thouoris and Troy

the date of Dicæarchus appears from what has been said above to agree exactly with that of the original Manetho.

The small number of *five* generations given by the Chronicle to Dynasty XIX seems to be justified and explained, Rameses V. being inclosed between four brothers who all together make but one generation; Amon-meses and Siphthah, in like manner, being inclosed between the last king of Dyn. XVIII Menephthah I. and his son Seti II. of Dyn. XIX, whose cousins they probably were; and the later Siphthah of M. Mariette seeming fit enough to coalesce with his co-regent and successor, with whom he was found conjoined, into a single generation. The actual kings of the dynasty, meantime, being no fewer than twelve, will give in 194 chronological years a seeming average of only 16 years and 2 months. But if the three illegitimate kings are omitted, and their years reckoned to the legitimate reigns, and if the later Siphthah is consolidated with his co-regent and successor, the remaining *eight* kings will have an average of 24 years and 3 months each.

To account for the number of "VII kings" (though perhaps Manetho never enumerated more than VI reigns), given in the heading of the list of Africanus, is not so easy, nor perhaps of any importance. Counting the two names Sethos and Rameses united mythically in the first reign, but really belonging to distinct kings, there are no doubt seven *names*; but to these there are only six *reigns*. And besides one king, there are also five years wanting in the list of Africanus to complete the sum 209 given for the dynasty, the VI reigns ($51 + 61 + 20 + 60 + 5 + 7$) making only 204 instead of 209 years. It is not safe to restore the 5 years wanting to the *second* reign (though we know from Josephus that the original Manetho gave it 66, and not 61 years), because Ptolemy of Mendes seems purposely to have cut off 13 years in all from the first two reigns; viz., 8 from the first, to suit the story of Danaus and Egyptus, and 13 from the first and second together, to suit, however inconsistently, the story of Sethos having been 13 years an exile in Ethiopia *after* the reign of his father (though *he*, too, was fabled to live on) while the Hierosolymites held Egypt. The 5 years which have dropped out must

be added somewhere below the first two reigns; and this being done, either with or without the insertion of a name (as if another Rameses or Amenemes had dropped out) to make up the *seven* kings, we must next restore from Josephus the figures of the original Manetho for the first two reigns. We then have $59 + 66 + 20 + 60 + 5 + 5 + 7$, amounting in all to 222, more by 13 than the sum given both by Manetho and by Ptolemy to the dynasty. For Ptolemy, cutting off 13 years from Manetho's first two reigns, but keeping his sum, necessarily added an equal compensation below. We have therefore now the 13 years thus added by Ptolemy to cut out from any of the later reigns which most invite such reduction; and, besides these, there are in Manetho's own sum of 209 *fifteen* unchronological years already restored to their true place in Dyn. XVIII, and now to be cut out from whatever part of this Dyn. XIX. it suits best; so in all 28 years are to be deducted.

As regards his VII kings, five of them at least may be pointed out with certainty in those actual and legitimate reigns which are the sources of the V Generations of the Chronicle. The three illegitimate kings, and any other who was only a co-regent, he might possibly omit. But such reigns as those of Seti II., Setnecht, Rameses III., the "eldest son" of the same Rameses III., and Scha-em-Djam, he could not fail either to name or to indicate. This being so, he must be supposed to have consolidated the sons of Rameses III. into two reigns, one of the eldest, and the other of the rest, or perhaps all of them into only one reign. For had he named them all four separately, he would, after naming the last of them, have already had seven actual legitimate kings, without any room for others to succeed them. The fifth generation of the Chronicle containing, as has been concluded above, two actual kings, these, if named separately, would bring up Manetho's number of reigns to six, so as to agree with our present lists. And perhaps it is more probable that no seventh was ever distinctly named by Manetho, than that he named separately one only out of the four (or five) sons of Rameses III., consolidating the rest, or that he named separately one or two of the illegitimate kings,

while he consolidated four legitimate kings into one. Neither chronological reasons, nor perhaps the five generations of the Chronicle, allow of the supposition that the dynasty ended with the last survivor of the sons of Rameses III.

After finding in the first reign Sethos II. and Rameses III. blended together into one mythical personage, we need not wonder if the following names and sums given for the reigns are difficult to identify. As for the names, "Rapsakes" is no doubt only a variation of Rameses, which is the family name common to nearly all these kings. ("Amenephthes," too, or Amenophis may be derived from an element almost equally common in the names of this dynasty.) And the designation "the eldest of his sons" coming after the *name* of Rameses III., however misplaced and blended with that of Sethos II., looks so far like a consolidation of the eldest four of the ten sons of Rameses III. The name "Rameses," as it occurs again in the fourth place, holds the place really belonging to the sons of Rameses III.: and if "Rapsakes," already in some sense identified with them, were put down from his connection with the mixed and mythical Sethos, ὁ καὶ Ῥαμεσσῆς, to stand after the distinct Rameses who is fourth in the lists, this latter would rise up into the third place, the true place of Rameses III.; and the Amenephthes who stands before him might then represent his father, whose name will form Ἀμενέχθης or Ἀμενέφθης, *Amen-necht*, as well as Setnecht; and so the first four kings would be restored to their true positions. The fifth name in the list of Africanus, "Amenemes," might also be connected with any one of three names which may seem to lay claim to this place; Amen-meri or Meri-amen being an element almost as common in the names of this dynasty as Rameses itself, and entering into the cartouches both of Rameses IX. of De Rouge, of the later Siphthah of M. Mariette, and of Scha-em-Djam his successor, whom Lepsius makes not to follow but to precede Siphthah. As for the name "Thouoris" or Phouoris, with the rendering Nilus, there is no trace of anything like it on the monuments. It seems rather to be an Egyptian accommodation of the Homeric name Polybus, which would write or pronounce equally Phriouv or Phiouro;

more may be meant by it than this, that the last king of Dyn. XIX is *chronologically* one with the Πόλυβος of Homer, the contemporary of the war of Troy, 436 years according to Dicaearchus before the first Olympiad, i. e. $(776 + 436 =)$ 1212 B.C.

As regards the *reigns*, considered apart from the names, the first two reigns of 59 and 66 years (if we let these sums stand, as we may, especially if Sethos was only five years old when he fled to Ethiopia) will take us at once from Thoth 1 in B.C. 1400, where Dyn. XVIII of the Chronicle ends, to B.C. 1275, 25 years below the epoch of the Sothic Cycle as observed at Thebes, and 47 below the same epoch for the latitude of Memphis; so that the reign of Rameses III., containing the Sothic epoch, and the *four* actual reigns preceding it, are fully covered. "Amenephthes," whom we have identified with the father of Rameses III., being thus already taken in, his separate 20 years may be omitted as part of those 28 years which we have to suppress; and in no case would it have been possible to think of *adding* them to the next following reign, whether covering only one king or four kings consolidated, for it has already 60 years of its own. Even after deducting from this sum the 8 years which we still have to suppress (the last reign or reigns of the dynasty claiming rather the addition of those five other years which we have to *restore*), the 52 years which remain are certainly quite enough for the elder four of ten sons to survive after a long reign of their father. And these 52 years bring us to B.C. 1223. Then, if we suppose Siphthah to be "Thouoris," and leave him his short reign of only seven years, only chronologically transposed, these go on to B.C. 1216; while, lastly, with the addition of those five that have fallen out from the list of Africanus, Amenemes or Scha-em-Djam will have to himself *as surviving alone* 10 instead of 7 years, and will close the dynasty coincidently with the close of Dyn. XIX of the Chronicle at B.C. 1206. According to the *apparent* chronology of Manetho however the 194 chronological years of this dynasty would begin 3 years, or rather 2 years and 10 months, later than Thoth 1, B.C. 1400, and would end 2 years and 10 months later than Thoth 1 in B.C. 1206.

Besides the monumental names hitherto enumerated, there still remain to be paralleled with Dyn. XX the following monumental kings:—

1. (Generation I of the Chronicle?) *Rameses XI.* (?) [X. of Lepsius, XIV. (?) of De Rougé]; *Meri* or *Mi-Amon*, *Amonha-chopesch*: *Ra-cheper-ma-Sotepenra*. His place is disputed. M. Mariette is quoted as saying that he reigned at least 17 years.

2. *Ra[meses XII.* (?)] [unplaced by Lepsius, but given as No. 523 in his Pl. xli.] *Ra-neter-cheper*, *Sotep-en-Amon*. De Rougé observes that at two places the order of succession is uncertain, and that there are in all three or four names of Ramessids which can be placed only conjecturally. The two places, he says, are, first, after the sons of Rameses III., and, secondly, before his Rameses XII. (?) under whom Her-Hor appears first as a subject, but with such titles as prepare one to find him afterwards on the throne.

3. (Generation II of the Chronicle?) *Rameses XIII.* ? [unplaced by Lepsius, but given as No. 524 in his Pl. xli.]; *Ra-hik-ma Djam-tseser*: *Rameses Merer-amon*.

And allowing for the three monumental names thus conjecturally placed in Dyn. XX, or for others which ought to be placed here instead of these, two full average generations, i.e. 49 years, they will reach from B.C. 1206 to B.C. 1157.

4. (Generation III of the Chronicle?) *Rameses XIV.* ? *Miamon II.* [XII. of Lepsius and of De Rougé, XIV. of Rosellini]; *Ra tseser-ma Sotepenra*. Five Apis-bulls, No. 19 to No. 23 were buried in his reign, and their tomb in the gallery of Rameses II. seemed to M. Mariette to come next after that of his Apis No. 18, which died under Rameses X. [VIII. of Bunsen]. A priest named Bekenphthah appears in command at Memphis under both reigns. Lepsius, however, has placed two kings between them; and the priest Bekenphthah was not necessarily the same person.

From a stele in the Louvre, explained by Mr. Birch and M. de Rougé, it appears that this king being in Mesopotamia to receive his tributes (among which precious wood from "*Ta-neteru*" is mentioned), he accepted the daughter of the Prince of Bachtan, and on his return made her queen

Dyn. XX. xii
Diospolis.
228 yrs. from
June 21, a.c.
1206, to April
25, a.c. 978.
135 years of
vil Rames-
sids. June 21,
a.c. 1206, to
May 19, a.c.
1071.

with the name *Neferou-ra*. In his 15th year, Epiphi 22, there arrived at Thebes an embassy with presents from the father of the queen *Neferou-ra*, asking the king of Egypt to send him a physician to prescribe for a younger sister of *Neferou-ra*, named *Bent-reschit*, who was suffering from some strange malady. The physician, being sent, declared that she was possessed by a spirit, which he had no power to expel. In the 26th year of the king, the 1st of Pachons, there came a second embassy, asking him to send one of the gods of Egypt to contend with the spirit. The king thereupon, taking one image of the god *Chons* before another of the same god but by a different and superior title, prayed the latter to send the former to *Bachtan*, giving him his own divine virtue to heal the prince's daughter. So the image was sent in its naos, mounted on a bark, with a cortège of boats to convey it down the Nile, and one chariot and an escort of cavalry for its land journey. After a voyage and journey of one year and five months from Thebes it arrived at *Bachtan*. The prince with his chiefs and his soldiers met the god, and prostrated themselves before him: when he was brought into the presence of *Bent-reschit*, she was instantly relieved, and the spirit within her welcomed his fellow demon thus: "Welcome, great God, Expeller of Rebels [a title of *Chons*]! the city of *Bachtan* is thine: its people are all thy subjects: I myself also am thy slave. I will return whence I came, that thou mayest be satisfied as to the object of thy journey: only, may it please thy Majesty to order that a festival be celebrated in my name by the Prince of *Bachtan*." Hereupon the god was pleased to say to his prophet, "The Prince of *Bachtan* must make a handsome offering to this spirit." The Prince, who meanwhile had been standing apart with his guards in profound awe, gave magnificent gifts both to the god *Chons* himself and to the spirit, and celebrated a festival in their honour: after which the spirit departed in peace whither he would. The Prince in ecstasy said within himself, This god must remain in *Bachtan*: I will not have him return to Egypt. So he abode there three years and nine months; after which, one night the Prince in a dream saw the god come out of his naos in the shape of a golden hawk, and fly away

in the direction of Egypt; and awaking he found himself [unwell]. So he sent back the god with great honour and pomp; and he returned safely to the temple of Chons at Thebes, which he re-entered on the 19th day of Mechir, in the 33rd year of the king, and gave all the rich presents he had received to the superior Chons, without reserving anything for his own special sanctuary. [From De Rougé's "*Etudes sur une Stele Egyptienne*," &c., Paris, 1858.]

Having reckoned above two average reigns of this dynasty to B.C. 1157, a third average reign would go on to B.C. 1132. Or, if the actual reign of Rameses XI. be supposed to begin in B.C. 1157, his 15th may be put at B.C. 1142, his 26th at 1131, and his 33rd in 1124. At any rate one may guess with some probability that the true date of the journey of the ark of Chons was later than the year B.C. 1149; and that between the first and second embassies of the Prince of Bachtan something had been heard of another Ark, which was carried about in Palestine.

5. (Generation IV of the Chronicle?) *Rameses XV.*? [XIII.? of De Rougé, and XIII. of Lepsius.] *Scha-em-Djam Neter-hak-On, Merer-Amen: Ra-men-ma Sotep-en-Phtha.* Under him first *Her-Hor* appears as high-priest of Ammon, and as yet only a subject, with the titles of "Head of Public Works," and "Fan-bearer on the left of the King;" but he is also "Chief of the Army," and "Chief of the Two Countries;" and he wears the uræus in the king's presence. His 18th year, according to M. de Rougé, is found on the monuments.

6. (Generation V of the Chronicle.) *Her-Hor-Si-amon*; the same as was mentioned above, but now with all the royal titles, his title of "High-priest of Ammon," being made into a throne-name. He is represented with Set and Horus; Set crowning him with the red crown of Lower Egypt, Horus with the white crown or *pshent* of Upper. His wife is named *Netem-Nit*, i. e. "Delight of Neith," according to M. de Rougé, who thinks this name indicates a connection with the Delta. This is the last king who thanks Ammon that "the chiefs of all the lands of the Rotennou fall down daily with their tributes at his feet." After his death De Rougé thinks

that Smendis, or whoever is alluded to by that name, founded an independent and contemporary dynasty in the Delta, the Tanite Dyn. XXI of Manetho. To this he supposes the kings bearing the names read by Lepsius "*Petuchanu*," but by himself "*Hor-Psev-en-schan*," to belong; and he identifies with this name the "Psusenes" and "Psinaches" of Manetho, observing that Shishonk I., the founder of the Bubastite Dyn. XXII of Manetho (the *Tanite* XXI of the Chronicle), is connected by the priesthood of Ammon with the priestly Diospolites descended from Her-Hor; and that he takes in his standard the title of "Uniter of the Upper and Lower Countries," which *therefore* had before been divided. Lepsius thinks Her-Hor himself the head of Manetho's Tanite Dyn. XXI. But it is plain that the XII Diospolite reigns of Manetho's Dyn. XX must include a line contemporary with the Tanites of his Dyn. XXI for 93 years at least; since the 135 years given by Manetho to the XII Diospolites of his Dyn. XX are plainly insufficient; and even with the full number of 228 years, which they have in the Chronicle, the average length of their reigns will not exceed 19 years. It has been observed that of the numerous sons of Her-Hor several seem to have borne Asiatic names.

The Rames-
sid kings end
at his death,
May 19, B.C.
1071.

7. Perhaps an unplaced Rameses. De Rougé places here Rameses X. of Lepsius, whom we have made to be IX., giving as a reason that the son of Her-Hor named *Pianch*, otherwise capable of being regarded as his successor, abstains from taking the royal titles, and is only "High-priest of Ammon," holding certain other high offices besides. Lepsius thinks this is best explained by supposing that *Pianch* died before his father. But, if so, De Rougé asks, how should he have the title of High-priest, which his father and his father's descendants *retained to themselves* when they took the royal standard and titles?

Five descen-
dants of Her-
Hor. 93 yrs.
from May 19,
B.C. 1071, to
April 28, B.C.
978?

8. (Generation VI of the Chronicle, or VII?) *Pinetem* I. (not *Pisem*) son of *Pianch*, and grandson of Her-Hor. He has titles of two classes, and keeps those which suit a subject after he has taken the royal titles and standard. Also he does not inclose his name in a cartouche, but leaves this distinction to the two princesses *Hent-ta* and *Rakamat*

(names recurring in the Tanite-Bubastite Dyn. XXI of the Chronicle, Dyn. XXII of Manetho), who were probably the heiresses of the Ramessids and his wives. His legends are found chiefly on the temple of Chons, where are also two cartouches ascribed by Lepsius to Pinetem II., and perhaps rightly, though they *may* have been taken later in life by Pinetem I., as his name has been found inclosed in a ring on a piece of leather: and these two cartouches are accompanied by the princess Hent-ta offering to Maut.

9. (Generation VII or VIII of the Chronicle?). *Ra-men-cheper*, son of Pinetem II., and high-priest, takes a double cartouche. The princess seen with him is named *Tsi-en-Chev*, which shows some connection with the first kings of Dyn. XIX. The same name reappears in Dyn. XXII.

[10. (?) *Psev-en-schan I.*, or *Petuchanu I.*, is here inserted by Lepsius (who found the name on bricks at *Tanis*) as father of Pinetem II. But on the pylon of Horus at Karnak a high-priest Pinetem is distinctly described as "son of Ra-men-cheper." De Rougé therefore argues that *Psev-en-schan* is probably one of the contemporary Tanites, whose independence commenced from after the death of Her-Hor.]

11. (?) (Generation VIII or IX of the Chronicle?) *Pinetem II.*, son of *Petuchanu* according to Lepsius, but of *Ra-men-cheper* according to De Rougé.

12. (?) *Petuchanu II.*, according to Lepsius (or *Psev-en-schan II.*) whose daughter *Rakamat* was married to *Osorkon* the second king of Dyn. XXII of Manetho, or XXI of the Chronicle. De Rougé doubts of the genealogy of the ancestors of *Shishonk I.* given by Lepsius, and thinks the Tanites had regained Thebes, and married the Theban heiresses, arguing from the fact that the priestly names at Thebes have been defaced, and that the names *Rakamat* and *Hent-ta* appear in connection with Dyn. XXII of Manetho (XXI of the Chronicle), *Hent-ta* being the name of the mother of the Queen *Keromama* in that dynasty. *Shishonk I.*, as has already been said, takes on his banner the title of "Uniter of the Two Countries."

The number of XII kings given by Manetho is thus made

out, or nearly made out; but it is not probable that this series of names is either quite accurate or quite complete.

Again, the VIII generations of the Chronicle are pretty clearly identifiable; Her-Hor, with his son, grandson, and great-grandson making four in the lower part of the dynasty, Rameses XV.(?) and XIV.(?) (XIII.(?) and XII. of De Rougé and Lepsius) being clearly two more, while the three unplaced Ramessids may sufficiently represent the first two generations of the dynasty.

All the names given above (except those of *Pseu-en-schan I.* and *II.*, which M. de Rougé does not admit) are found at Thebes, joined with indications of the decay of the older Ramessid family, and of a transition of power, through the assumption of the royal prerogatives and titles, to the high-priests of Ammon. The last seven names show of themselves that even though connected in some way, as they no doubt were, with the preceding Ramessids, they were on the whole of another lineage. But there is no sufficient evidence to show that these last seven kings were connected principally, either by origin or residence, with Tanis or its neighbourhood in Lower Egypt; still less to identify their names with the names given by Manetho for his Tanite Dyn. XXI. Taking all the thirteen names as they are found on the monuments at Thebes, or elsewhere, their number justifies that given by Manetho for the kings of his Diospolite Dyn. XX; but it requires, as has been remarked already above, the 228 years of the Chronicle for the true duration of the dynasty; seeing that XII kings in 135 years would reign on an average only 11 years and 3 months apiece; and the average of 19 years, which would be given by the sum 228, is quite as short as there are any indications in the way of decay or disorder to account for. The repetition of one and the same name Rameses for fourteen or fifteen kings, made known by the monuments, affords an opportune explanation both of the growing negligence of Manetho in Dyn. XIX, where he consolidates names, and of his total omission of names in his Dyn. XX, the number of kings only being there stated. And though it is true that the last six or seven names are no longer Ramessids,

still, as these were Thebans, and even at Thebes perhaps of doubtful legitimacy, most of whose years he cuts off from Dyn. XX of the Chronicle and transfers to a new interpolated dynasty of "Tanites," it is not wonderful that his disposition to treat the Ramessids only in the aggregate extended to these also. With the knowledge that we have of the style of his narrative, so entirely unhistorical, in which his extracts from the hieratic lists were incidentally inserted, we can understand a treatment of this Dyn. XX which in any true historian or antiquary, even though a native of Lower Egypt, would have been inexplicable.

As regards his Tanite Dyn. XXI, if we had not the older Chronicle as a guide, and if Manetho's own number of Theban kings in his Dyn. XX, and the number of Theban names on the monuments, had not already required the restoration of the 93 years cut off by him from the Diospolites of the Chronicle, we should have had no little difficulty. For we should have found the accession of Shishonk I. (identified by the Theban monuments with the conqueror of Judæa, and the first monumental Tanite or Bubastite king) depressed in the lists by an older Tanite dynasty to Feb. 10, B.C. 938, 39 years and 10 months below Thoth 1, in B.C. 978, i. e. nearly 39 below the death of Solomon. And lower down the accession of the last Ethiopian king Tirhakah would have seemed to stand by the lists at Dec. 12, B.C. 702, nearly 8 years too low for the synchronism of the 14th year of Hezekiah. But the monuments afford no traces of Manetho's Tanite Dyn. XXI, regarded as a sovereign dynasty of all Egypt. The Theban monuments take us directly from the XII Theban kings of Manetho's anonymous Dyn. XX to Shishonk I. the head of his Bubastite Dyn. XXII. This Dyn. XXII of Manetho agrees in its sum within one year with the Tanite Dyn. XXI of the Chronicle; nor is there any real difference in its designation. And its commencement according to the Chronicle, at April 25, B.C. 978, just exhibits Shishonk I. as contemporary with Solomon as well as with Rehoboam. Manetho, by leaving six of its kings anonymous, seems to hint that as many names of his Dyn. XXI are their representatives above. And lastly,

Dyn. XXI.
iv or v Tanites. 93,
from May 19
B.C. 1071, to
April 25, B.C.
978.

having already seen 93 years to be reclaimed not only by Dyn. XX of the Chronicle, but even by Manetho's number of XII Diospolites of his own Dyn. XX, we shall find the remaining 37 years of his Dyn. XXI to be no less certainly due to other places far below. On putting these indications together, the result is that this first Tanite Dyn. XXI of Manetho vanishes, chronologically at least, leaving his Diospolite Dyn. XX in possession of 93 of its years, so as to coincide *really* in its ending with Dyn. XX of the Chronicle, at B.C. 978. The remaining 37 years, or 36 of them (since one year is wanted to make Manetho's Bubastite Dyn. XXII equal the Tanite-Bubastite Dyn. XXI of the Chronicle) with 3 more (or 2 and 10 months) by which Manetho has been in advance of the Chronicle from the beginning, making 40 in all, or 40 short by 2 months, remain in hand, as a surplus, to insert below whenever we find ourselves falling short of the Chronicle.

At the same time, as has been said above, it does not follow either that the names of Manetho's Tanite Dyn. XXI are fictitious, or, even if they are, that there was not some connection between the later kings of Dyn. XX and Lower Egypt to which Manetho might allude through his interpolated Tanite Dynasty XXI. Shishonk I., the true founder of the first Tanite-Bubastite dynasty which appears on the monuments, might have been already independent in Lower Egypt before he became master of Thebes, or could quarry stone at Silsilis. Even his father and grandfather, or those of his wife, and others before them (since every house must have had a beginning), might have been growing in power in the Delta as the Theban families were declining and divided. And the precise degree of their power, the titles taken by them, and the spot of their residence and their origin, are points on which we must look to the monuments and to fresh discoveries for information.

Now the names of the following Dyn. XXII of Manetho, as Mr. Birch has pointed out, are very peculiar, quite unlike those of the Thebans of XVIII, XIX, and XX, whether Ramessids or others, and showing traces rather of some Assyrian or Babylonian connection, being such as Shishonk,

Osorkon, Nimrot, Keromama. And Lepsius has published in his *Königsbuch* the pedigree of Shishonk I. from his sixth ancestor. These six names, which are *Boueeouā*, *Maōsen*, *Nebneza*, *Petut*, *Shishonk*, and *Nimrot*, have no accompanying emblems of royalty. The grandmother however of Shishonk I., *Mehtenhont*, wife of his grandfather Shishonk, after whom he seems to have been named, was a king's daughter; and his son and successor Osorkon I. married *Rakamat*, daughter of *Psev-en-schan* or *Petuchanu* II., the last king according to Lepsius of the Diospolites, whom he, to accommodate them to Manetho's lists, calls Tanites. And the name *Psev-en-schan*, or as he writes it *Petuchanu*, having been found by him on bricks in the mounds of Tanis, may seem to indicate, for the two kings of this name at least, a real Tanite connection; for which reason M. De Rougé is for separating them from those other names, found at Thebes, which belong certainly to the descendants of Her-Hor. Signs however of some connection between the highpriests of Ammon at Thebes and the Eastern part of the Delta have been noticed as existing at a much earlier date under Dyn. XIX, when a highpriest of Ammon, *Rameses-Nechtu*, was named under *Rameses IV.* as son of *Pet-Bast*, *Bast* being the great goddess of Bubastis. But whatever becomes of Manetho's Dyn. XXI, those alliances which are indicated by the monuments, especially by the pedigree alluded to, sufficiently account for the rise of the family of Shishonk I.; and they make it probable that he had already begun to reign in Lower Egypt some time before he became master of Thebes. So the last name, "*Susenes*" (which is probably only a varied form of *Shishonk*), in Manetho's Dyn. XXI may be admitted perhaps as designating one and the same king with the first name "*Sesonchis*" of his Dyn. XXII, but representing an earlier reign or co-regnancy before he became sovereign of all Egypt. Of the remaining six names of Manetho's Dyn. XXI two, the second and the fifth, another *Psousenes* and an *Osorkon*, look like anticipations of names of his Dyn. XXII; two more, the first of the dynasty and the fourth, *Ismendes* and *Amenophthis*, remind one of the Diospolitan dynasties at

the expense of which this has been fabricated; another, Nephhercheres, the third, takes us back to far earlier times; while the sixth, Psinaches, which alone remains, even if identified with Petuchanu, would scarcely suffice to make all the 6 or 7 later Diospolites into a real Tanite dynasty of which Manetho should have only corrupted the names. But none of these six as they stand, as kings, receive any countenance either from the Tanite-Bubastite pedigree of Shishonk I. published by Lepsius, or from those Diospolite names of the monuments which he would identify with the Tanite Dyn. XXI of Manetho. Still they probably indicate the growing importance in Lower Egypt of some Tanite family.

Dyn. XXII.
ix Bubastites.
169. April 23,
A.C. 978, to
March 14,
A.C. 809.

But as regards Dyn. XXII of Manetho, which we have now made to coincide with XXI of the Chronicle, recent discoveries have enabled us to fill up the six names left blank by Manetho; and the list of the ix actual kings is given by Lepsius as follows:

1. *Shishonk I.*, Σέσωγγις (his 21st year occurs on the monuments): Manetho gives him . . . 21
2. *Osorkon I.*, Ὀσὸρθων: Manetho gives him . . . 15
3. *Takelot I.* (his 12th is marked at Karnak)
4. *Osorkon II.* (his 23rd is on an Apis-stele)
5. *Shishonk II.* The three are anonymous in the lists, and have together 25 [29?] years. } 29?
6. *Takelot II.* Τακέλωθις (his 14th is on an Apis-stele): Manetho gives him . . . 13
7. *Shishonk III.* (In his 28th an Apis was born which died in the 2nd of Pichai, aged 26 years. So Shishonk III. reigned over 51 full years, and the Apis-bull was allowed to live over 25 years)
8. *Pichai* (grandson of Shishonk III?—his 2nd occurs).
9. *Shishonk IV.* (An Apis died in his 37th.) Manetho again throwing together these last three reigns without names gives them all a sum of only . . . 42

Sum given 120

On a stele found in the tomb of that Apis which died in the 37th of Shishonk IV., Horpeson, the dedicator, priest

of Neith, names fifteen generations of his own family, so going back six generations above the head of Dyn. XXII of Africanus. And to the eleventh degree backwards he names both father and mother. He was in the sixth degree from a king of the reigning family; and from this ancestor upwards the kings of the dynasty are named as his ancestors, while the highest six (above Shishonk I.) are probably the citizen ancestors of the Bubastite family, reaching seemingly to the times of Her-Hor (whom Lepsius supposes to have been himself by origin from Tanis, and so the founder of Manetho's Dyn. XXI).

After adding, as above, 4 years to one of the reigns or sums of reigns in the present text of Manetho's lists, to produce the sum of 120 given for the dynasty, and after further adding one year more from the 37 unchronological years of his Dyn. XXI to raise the sum of this dynasty to 121 years to coincide with the 121 which it has as Dyn. XXI of the Chronicle,—if we divide 121 by 9, we obtain an average length of reign for the IX kings of only 13 years and 3 months; whereas the Chronicle gives to the 121 years of its Dyn. XXI only VI generations with an average even so of only 20 years and 2 months, representing perhaps the actual reigns. Again, therefore, the number of kings given by Manetho forces us to the conclusion that he has improperly compressed into 120 years those IX kings which in the Chronicle are divided between its two Tanite Dynasties XXI and XXII, the former with six generations and reigns in 121 years, the latter with three generations or reigns in 48 years. And the indications of the monuments justify this inference, showing that the years assigned by Manetho are far from representing the true length of the reigns. The genealogy too has been made out with sufficient fulness to show that, apart from any care for the average length of reigns, the author of the Chronicle had no such reason to make six of the nine actual reigns into only two generations as the consolidations exhibited by Manetho would suggest, or as the monuments in other cases, as in that of the four sons of Rameses III., have been seen to afford.

So, then, the first six generations, or perhaps the first *seven*

actual reigns, of these nine Tanite or Bubastite kings (and their special residence seems to have been at Bubastis, though the Chronicle names only Tanis, the original capital of the Delta), take us, according to the Chronicle, from B.C. 978 to B.C. 857; and the remaining three generations, or perhaps only *two* actual reigns, take us on to B.C. 809, when we have already exhibited the Tanite Dyn. XXII of the Chronicle, and are advanced 48 years into the 89 of Manetho's Dyn. XXIII, which he also calls Tanite. The first name in this dynasty, Petubast, is displaced, unless he were concurrent, by the continuance of the preceding kings, and must be put down over the heads of his two successors, Osorchon and Psammis, whose 18 full years in the list of Africanus identify them pretty clearly with the two generations in 19 years, making Dyn. XXIII of the Chronicle. The names certainly indicate the same lineage with the Tanites and Bubastites preceding; but the Chronicle may have had some ground, notwithstanding, for calling them, as it does, Diospolites, just as, in Dyn. XXIV, both the Chronicle and Manetho designate as Saïtes kings whose names (Petubast, and perhaps Takelut) still show traces of the Tanite-Bubastite lineage. So with

Dyn. XXIII.
ii Tanites. 19,
from March
14, B.C. 809,
to March 9,
B.C. 790.

1. { *Osorkon IV.*, 'Οσόρχων of the monuments, and
2. { *Psimut*, Ψάμμους, whose name occurs at *Thebes*,

we have advanced to B.C. 790, and have completed Dynasty XXIII of the Chronicle, and $(48 + 19 =)$ 67 years of the 89 of Dyn. XXIII of Manetho, having 22 still remaining to go, with the names of Petubast and Zet put down, and with the single name of Bocchoris with only 6 years, which constitutes his Saïte Dynasty XXIV, towards the three generations and 44 years of the Saïte Dynasty XXIV of the Chronicle. This dynasty also is represented on the monuments by two out of its three names, viz.—

Dyn. XXIV.
iii Saïtes. 44.
March 9, B.C.
790, to Feb.
26, B.C. 740.

1. *Pet-si-bast*, Πετουβάστης, and
- [2. *Zḥr*, or whatever is the true name, has not yet been discovered on the monuments]
3. *Bek-en-ranf*, Βόκχορις. An Apis-bull, No. 34 of M. Mariette, died in the 6th year of Bocchoris; and this Apis

being buried in the same chamber with Apis No. 33, which died in the 37th year of Shishonk IV., with signs of his being the immediate successor, M. Mariette concludes "that during the 89 years of Manetho's Dynasty XXIII no Apis appeared." But we have seen that the first 48 years of the 89 of Manetho's Dynasty XXIII are really covered by the 1x kings of his Dyn. XXII, of whom Shishonk IV. is the last. Supposing, therefore, the Apis No. 34 to have been born in the 37th year of Shishonk IV., and Shishonk to have reigned no more than 37 years, the true interval *cannot* comprise *less* than the 19 years of Dyn. XXIII of the Chronicle + two years for two out of the three reigns of Dyn. XXIV + 5 years of Bocchoris, in all 26 years; nor, on the other hand, *can* it contain *more* than 19 + 38 + 5, that is, in all 62 years. Between these extreme limits it must be determined, in default of fresh discoveries, approximately, by considering how far we may venture to go on the one hand in extending the life of the bull beyond the *minimum* of 26 years, and on the other in shortening the reigns of the first two kings of Dynasty XXIV, Bocchoris being certainly the third and last. If Petubast reigned only 12 years, and Zet, or whoever was the second king, only one, the bull's life, if he were born in the year of his supposed predecessor's death, would still be extended to the length of 39 years.

According to one writer, Τεχνάτις, which is only another form of writing Τακέλωθις, according to another *Tnephactos*, which may be a corruption of the same, was the father of Bocchoris. But leaving this question, which further discoveries alone can solve, we observe that Manetho, at the end of this ignominious Saite Dyn. XXIV, is short of the end of the same in the Chronicle by 16 years, which we must supply from the 36 unchronological years of his Dyn. XXI still available. With 16 of these allowed to reckon as depressing the years below them, his Dyn. XXIV may be made to end coincidently with the same Dyn. XXIV in the Chronicle at B. C. 746.

The Ethiopian Dyn. XXV of III Generations in the Dyn. XXV.
III Ethiopians. Chronicle, and of III actual reigns according to Manetho, is 63. Feb. 26,

B.C. 746, to
Feb. 11, A.C.
683.

fully illustrated by the monuments, which exhibit its three kings, Sabaco, Sevechus, and Taracus of the lists, thus:—

1. *Shabak*, Σαβάκωv. (An Apis-bull, No. 35, died in his 2nd year; and in the same chamber were found traces of the cartouches of his successor Shabatok, connected perhaps with the burial of another bull.)

2. *Shabatok*, Σεβίχως.

3. *Tahark*, Ταράκης. Mechir 13 of his 24th is marked on a stele as the date of the death of the Apis No. 36.

But the monuments seem to indicate that the reigns of these three kings lasted longer than the 40 years of Manetho, or even than the 44 of the Chronicle (for Manetho again falls short by 4 years), so as to justify the assertion of Herodotus that the Ethiopian Sabaco (for he blends the three kings into one) ruled Egypt "above 50 years." But in this, as in other cases, the Chronicle might have some fair ground for assigning them only 44 years (and of course it would give them as few as possible). If, for example, as has been said above, it were after 44 years that Tirhakah "voluntarily retired from Egypt," making Napata his capital (of which the monuments afford proof), while Egypt from that time began again to be governed by native rulers, though divided, and still for a time indirectly and partially under Ethiopian supremacy: so when the 40 years of Manetho have been filled up to 44, and his Dynasty XXV made to end in B.C. 702, where it ends according to the Chronicle, his 40 surplus years unchronologically inserted above (37 of them in his Dyn. XXI and the other 3 long before) are reduced to 19, still uncompensated, which depress the end of the Ethiopian dynasty from B.C. 702, where it is put by the Chronicle, to 683, as if that dynasty really lasted not only 44 years to the time when Tirhakah ceased to reign personally in Egypt, but in all to his death 63 years; and it is highly probable that this was really the case.

Anarchy, 8.
Feb. 10, A.C.
683, to Feb. 9,
A.C. 678, or
dodecarchy,
30, to Feb. 6,
A.C. 468.

Manetho, then, having already covered by years unchronologically placed above in his Dyn. XXI, or earlier, 19 of those years which the Chronicle reckons to its Dyn. XXVI, or, to speak more exactly, 19 all but two months (Dynasty XVII of Manetho as restored from Josephus having had a

sum of 259 years and 10 months which we have been reckoning as 260 current years), it is plain that he still wants 158 years, or 158 years and 2 months, to make his Dyn. XXVI of ix Saïtes end coincidently with the Memphitico-Saïte Dynasty XXVI of the Chronicle, which has vii generations in 177 years. But, in fact, Manetho gives to his ix Saïtes only 150 years and 6 months, seemingly less by 7 years and 8 months, but really by 8 years and 2 months, than what are wanted. Respecting the true chronological place of this deficit there can be no doubt, as the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses is the point from which both Manetho and the Chronicle in common make the next dynasty, that of the Persians, to commence; and there is no room for the insertion of any years into the lists of Manetho between the accession of Psammitichus I. and the conquest of Cambyses. It follows, therefore, that the 8 years and 2 months wanting have been omitted by Manetho from the same place with the 19 years last considered, of which they were chronologically the continuation. And we shall see that Manetho compensates for his omission of these 8 years and 2 months, by an unchronological insertion of them below, where they can have no place, just as he compensated above, by an unchronological anticipation in his Dynasty XXI or earlier, for those $(16 + 4 + 19 =)$ 39 years of the Saïtes and Ethiopians of Dynasties XXIV and XXV which he determined to omit at their true places. So we need not make any difficulty at finding that, according to his *apparent* chronology, his Saïte Dynasty XXVI would end, and Cambyses ("in his 5th Persian year") would conquer Egypt as early as May in B.C. 533, that is, in the 4th year before the death of Cyrus. But understanding what he himself understands and hints (though on the surface he seems quite regardless of chronology), we may use by anticipation and place next after the Ethiopians, from Dec. 8, B.C. 684, to Feb. 9, B.C. 675, all those 8 years and 2 months which we shall find inserted where they can have no true chronological place below. These 8 years and 2 months will consist, first, of the 6 months of Psammichierites, the ninth and last king of Manetho's Dyn. XXVII, these being really included in the 3 years of

Cambyases, whose conquest is antedated by some 6 months, so as to be set at the *beginning* of his 5th Persian year. Next there are 4 months added to the 124 years of the Persian dynasty. Then the whole 6 years of Dyn. XXVIII of Manetho are unchronological; and lastly, 1 year and 4 months added by him to his Dyn. XXIX. These additions, making in all 8 years, besides 2 odd months (the old debt due as complement to the fraction of 10 months of Manetho's Dyn. XVII of the Shepherds), take us from Feb. 11, B. C. 583 (strictly Dec. 8, B. C. 584), to Feb. 9, B. C. 575, whence there are 150 true years to the end of the 44th of Amasis and the beginning of the 5th Persian and 1st Egyptian year of Cambyases, Jan. 2, B. C. 525, where the Chronicle also ends its Memphitico-Saite and commences its Persian dynasty.

Dyn. XXVI.
v Saïtes. 138.
Feb. 6, B. C.
663, to Jan. 2,
B. C. 525.

It is plain, both from the monuments and from Herodotus, that Psammitichus I. was really the founder of this Saïte dynasty; and the monuments prove that the whole space covered by the five kings from Psammitichus to Amasis inclusive (Psammicherites being included as aforesaid in the 5th year of Cambyases), amounted to 138 years lying between Feb. 6, B. C. 663, and Jan. 2, B. C. 525. Manetho, therefore, in giving to the five kings only ($54 + 6 + 6 + 19 + 44 =$) 129 years, falls short of the true sum of their reigns by 9 years, which must be taken from the three nominal reigns of ($7 + 6 + 8 =$) 21 years which in his lists precede the accession of Psammitichus I. After this deduction, 12 years still remain attached to three names preceding that of Psammitichus I., and covering the interval from B. C. 675, to B. C. 663. Thus the whole interval from the retirement of Tirhakah from Egypt to Napata to the accession of Psammitichus I. is collected from Manetho and the Chronicle to have been ($19 + 8 + 12 =$) 39 years, and the whole interval from the death of Tirhakah and the end of Ethiopian supremacy to the accession of Psammitichus is 20 years, which last 20 years must be supposed to contain the dodecarchy of Herodotus and the "anarchy" of Diodorus. But the first three names of the dynasty in Manetho's lists are probably meant to cover indirectly—and the first two generations of the VII of the

Chronicle certainly cover—the whole 39 years which intervened between the retirement of Tirhakah and the accession of Psammitichus I. So VIII nominal kings of Manetho would have an average of 22 years, while the VII generations of the Chronicle have an average of 25 years and something over 2 months each. But if Manetho's lists were taken simply as they stand, IX actual kings, in only 150 years and 6 months, would seem to have average reigns of only 16 years and between 8 and 9 months each; and if even the last king were omitted, the remaining VIII in 150 years would have only 18 years and between 8 and 9 months each.

Necho I., the father of Psammitichus I., is named by Herodotus, not indeed as having actually reigned, but as having had some apparent title for reigning, on account of which he was slain by the Ethiopian Sabaco, a name which with Herodotus covers equally Sevechus and Tirhakah, while Psammitichus I., then very young, was saved by being carried into Syria. Of the two preceding names, Stephinates and Nechepsos, intended perhaps to connect Psammitichus I. with the native Saïtes who had reigned before the Ethiopian invasion, neither Herodotus nor the monuments afford any trace. But the monuments, especially at Thebes, do exhibit other names belonging to the interval between Tirhakah's withdrawal to Napata and the accession or undisputed sovereignty of Psammitichus I. A king named *Kasto* or *Kasen* is found, and his daughter *Amuniritis*, whose cartouches, according to Lepsius, are respected, while those of her consort, a king named *Pianchi*, are defaced. She and her husband may be the source of the “*Ἀμμερίς, Αἰθίοψ*,” who heads Dyn. XXVI with 12 years in the list of Eusebius, though whence precisely Eusebius obtained so important a variant is not easy to conjecture. The name *Pianchi* belongs also to two other kings, successors of Tirhakah at Napata, and no doubt of the same family. A daughter of *Pianchi* and *Amuniritis* again, named *Sepunteput*, being married to Psammitichus I., brought to aid him in establishing his new dynasty both a title to Theban legitimacy and an Ethiopian connection; though as a separate line of kings reigned after Tirhakah at Napata, Psammiti-

chus, in spite of this connection, had still need to keep an army on his southern frontier. Kasto or Kasen, then, with his queen, and their daughter the queen Amuniritis with her husband Pianchi, may represent the first two of the VII generations given by the Chronicle to its Dyn. XXVI; and the whole series of the Chronicle may be exhibited from the monuments as follows:—

(Generation I.) *Kasto* or *Kasen*. He began to reign under Tirhakah, on his withdrawal to Napata in Ethiopia, Feb. 15, in the year B.C. 702?

(Generation II.) *Ammuniritis* (*Ἀμμερίτις*?) and *Pianchi* (*Αἰθίοψ*?), who reigned at least 12 years according to an inscription on the bandages of a mummy in the British Museum, mentioned by M. Mariette. The time given to these two generations, answering to the first three names of Manetho's IX kings, ends Feb. 6, B.C. 663.

(Generation III.) *Psamtik I.* 54, from Feb. 6, B.C. 663, to Jan. 23, B.C. 609. From his accession to the end of the 44th of Amasis, viz. Jan. 2, B.C. 525, the whole interval is shown by the monuments to be 138 years; consequently his accession is to be put at Thoth 1, B.C. 663. An important inscription, connecting the reign of Psamtik I. with that of Tirhakah is thus given by M. Mariette from a stele of his Apis, No. 37:—"In the year 20, Messori 20 [Jan. 15, B.C. 643?] under the king [Psamtik I.] was manifested this Apis, living towards heaven [i. e. he died]. This God was conducted to join the good Amenti [i. e. was buried] in the year 21, Paophi 25. He was *born* in the 26th of the king [Tirhakah] and conducted into Ptah-hat-ka [i. e. was installed at Memphis] Pharmouthi 9. [This stele was] made in the year 21 [of Psamtik I.]" M. Mariette observes, that he would have been glad to translate the last words "[II] fit [sa vie] en 21 ans," "He lived in all 21 years," but the form for duration of life is too uniform and too well-known to admit of any doubt. To which we may add, that the whole inscription is beautifully cut, and the figures and names as clear as could be wished. Unless therefore any one should imagine that the date for the birth of this Apis was really unknown, and was put conjecturally in the 26th of Tirhakah, as

being the year of the death of his predecessor, it is necessary either to bring down arbitrarily the 26th of Tirhakah below B.C. 683, which we have found to be indicated by Manetho as the year of his death, or else to admit that this Apis-bull lived at least 40 years. If the 26th of Tirhakah is put down below B.C. 683, it follows that his first had not yet begun in the 14th year of Hezekiah, B.C. 709; and the difficulty hence arising is only awkwardly palliated by supposing, without other grounds, that Tirhakah was already, in B.C. 709, associated with his father, though his years were reckoned afterwards from his later accession after his father's death. But it seems that this Apis, No. 37, attracted far more veneration than any of his predecessors, no less than 168 votive stelæ, 53 of them dated, having been found, as M. Mariette relates, in his tomb. This extraordinary veneration must certainly have had *some* cause; and extraordinary longevity is the most natural cause, in such a case, that the imagination could suggest. It is just the explanation which would have commended itself even without proof; but being forced upon us, as it is, by separate chronological indications, it is certainly not to be rejected. The day of the bull's death, according to the stele above mentioned, was 20 Mechir, i. e. Jan. 15, and so seemingly at the end of the 20th year of Psammitichus I.; and M. Mariette observes that all the dates of the dated stelæ found in the tomb fall within the 70 days of the funeral, during which alone on such occasions the tomb remained open. He adds that this was the last Apis buried in the older Apis-cemetery of Rameses II., and before the inauguration of the magnificent new galleries of Psammitichus I., in which the next Apis, No. 38, was buried by that king, in his 52nd year. So here again there was an interval between these two Apises of 32 years. Only in this case it is open to suppose that there may have been another bull between, whose tomb has not been found; or else that there was an interval of some years between the death of No. 37 and the birth of his successor, though in general "the search of the Egyptians for their Apis 'did not last long.'" After these two Apises, the next, No. 39, was born in the 53rd year of Psammitichus I., Mechir 19, and he died in the

16th year of Necho, on the 6th day of the second month, Paophi, aged 16 years, 7 months, and 7 days.

(Generation IV.) *Necho*. 15, and part of a 16th, Jan. 23, B.C. 609, to Jan. 19, B.C. 594. The Apis No. 40 of M. Mariette, was born in his 16th year, Paophi 7; was installed in the 1st of Psamtik II., Epiphi 9; and died in the 12th of Ouaphre, Pharmouthi 12, aged 17 years, 6 months, and 5 days. Hence it seems that the 16th of Necho's actual reign is imperfect, and that part of the first year of the actual reign of Psamtik II. enters into the same civil year. Consequently the whole of that civil year will technically be reckoned as the first of Psamtik II., though Necho may still have technically as well as actually a sixteenth year, when his accession is antedated so as to cover the fractional months of his predecessor.

(Generation V.) *Psamtik II.* 6, from Jan. 19, B.C. 594 to Jan. 18, B.C. 588. The Apis No. 40, above mentioned, shows him to have reigned 5 years complete, and a sixth, identical in part with the 16th of his predecessor.

(Generation VI.) *Ouaphre-het*. 19, from Jan. 18, B.C. 588 to Jan. 13, B.C. 569. The Apis No. 40 died in his 12th; but the next Apis, No. 41, was not born till the 5th of Amasis. Two stelæ at Leyden and Florence, giving the births of two men in regnal years of Necho, and their deaths in regnal years of Amasis, both fix the interval between the year named of Necho and the year of the same number of Amasis, to be 40 years. Wherefore, as the 16 of Necho and the 6 of Psamtik II. have been found to make together only 21, Ouaphre-het must have had 19 years complete.

(Generation VII.) *Aahmes*. 44, from Jan. 13, B.C. 569, to Jan. 2, B.C. 525. The Apis No. 41 was born in his 5th year, Thoth 7, and died in his 23rd, Phamenoth 6, having lived 18 years and 6 months. The 44th of Amasis is found on the monuments; consequently his accession, reckoned up from Jan. 2 in B.C. 525, should be at Jan. 13, in B.C. 569, and that of Necho at Jan. 23, in 609; and that of Psamtik I. at Feb. 6, in B.C. 663. Lastly,

Psamtik III., the Psammenitus of Herodotus and Psam-micherites of the lists of Manetho and his ninth king, ap-

pears on the monuments; but he has no place chronologically, as his 6 months are included in the 5th Persian year of Cambyses, in the course of which he conquered Egypt, and from the beginning of which commences his technical or antedated Egyptian reign.

According to our scale of sacred Chronology, combined with that of the old Chronicle, the Egyptian accession of Sabaco being fixed to Feb. 26, B.C. 746, the dealings of Hoshea, king of Israel, with So, Sua, or Segor (probably Sevechus of the lists), should be about B.C. 720, 3 years before the capture of Samaria, in B.C. 717, or perhaps a little earlier; the coming forth of Tirhakah from Ethiopia to meet Sennacherib, in the 14th of Hezekiah, should be in B.C. 709.

The Persian Dyn. XXVII of Manetho, with VIII actual kings in 124 years and 4 months, is of course *really* identical and coincident (the 4 months being unchronological, and having been already anticipated at their true place) with Dyn. XXVIII of the Chronicle, which has *v* generations in 124 years. It takes us from Jan. 2, in B.C. 525, to Dec. 2, in B.C. 402, i. e. to the end of the second antedated or technical year of Artaxerxes Mnemon, the five *generations* of the Chronicle being plainly derived from the five principal *reigns* of Cambyses, Darius Hystaspes, Xerxes, Artaxerxes Longimanus, and Darius Nothus, yet not to be confounded with them as if their end was necessarily coincident with that of the last reign of the five alluded to. Manetho, naming the three short actual reigns of Artabanus after Xerxes, and of Xerxes II. and Sogdianus after Artaxerxes Longimanus, omits, which is remarkable, the Magian Bardas after Cambyses, though he reigned seven months and the second Xerxes only two. And in order to avoid naming a ninth king, Artaxerxes Mnemon, or rather to gain in appearance two years above, six years instead of four are given by him (in the list of Africanus) to Cambyses, although it is distinctly said, in the heading of the dynasty, that he reduced Egypt "in his fifth," not his third, "Persian year." And his three years, increased to four by including the seven months of the Magian usurper, reach from B.C.

Dyn. XXVII.
v Persian.
124. Jan. 2,
B.C. 525, to
Dec. 2, B.C.
402.

525 to B.C. 521. On the monuments are found for this dynasty—

(Generation I., reign i.) *Kambatet*. 4, from Jan. 2. B.C. 525, to Jan. 1, B.C. 521. He also appears by the name of *Ramesout*; for on his first conquering Egypt, he was enthroned as a legitimate Egyptian king, and took this Egyptian name, and was instructed in all the mysteries of Neith at Sais, and confirmed the priesthood in their privileges: he appears besides in the Serapeum as a devout worshipper of Apis; all which explains the assertion of Herodotus, *ὅτι οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι οἰκησύνται τὸν Καμβύση*. So his violence or madness was only after his return from Ethiopia. An Apis born in his 5th (whence it appears that *he* reckoned his own years in Egypt from his Persian accession) on the 28th day of the 5th month, and which died in the 4th year of Darius on the 3rd day of the 9th month, is said to have lived 7 years, 3 months, and 4 days. Assuming the actual accession of Cambyses to have been soon after the new year, this Apis would be born early in June B.C. 525, and may have been stabbed by Cambyses on his return from Ethiopia. And it seems that he did not die so very soon after his wound. The stele on which the death of this Apis is recorded was misread at first, so as to make him live eight years instead of seven, and it is not the only instance where such mistakes, having had attention drawn to them, have been subsequently corrected. So in another stele, $\text{|||||}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\eta}$ is the year of Amasis in which another Apis was either born or installed; and Lepsius reads this 17, De Rougé more correctly 25. For this same Apis is recorded to have been buried by Cambyses in his 6th year, in the 11th month; that is, if his actual accession had coincided with his technical or antedated accession, in November, B.C. 524, when he may have been on the point of commencing his Ethiopian expedition. Now, if || , as read by Lepsius, was originally written on the stele, this Apis at his death would be 29 years old; but if $\bar{\eta}$, as read by De Rougé, he would be only 17, which is certainly more probable.

(Generation II., reign of Manetho ii, actual reign iii.) *Ntarioush*, Darius. 36, from Jan. 1, B.C. 521, to Dec. 23, B.C. 486. He built most of the great temple in the larger

Oasis, and takes there titles identical with those of the old Egyptian kings.

(Generation III., reign of Manetho iii, actual reign vi.) *Kheshirsh*, Xerxes. 21, from Dec. 23, B. C. 486, to Dec. 18, B. C. 465 (under whom Achæmenes was Satrap of Egypt 24 years, from B. C. 484 to B.C. 460).

(Generation IV., reign of Manetho v, actual reign vi.) *Artachsheshes*, Artaxerxes. 41, from Dec. 18, B. C. 465, to Dec. 8, B. C. 460. In his 5th year Inaros revolted, B. C. 460. He was crucified probably in B.C. 455. Herodotus visited Egypt soon after the Persian dominion had been re-established, in B. C. 450? In the 15th of Artaxerxes the Athenians sent a fleet to restore Amyrtæus, whose name has been found on the monuments; but the project came to nothing.

(Generation v., reign of Manetho viii, actual reign ix; and a 10th actual reign, of Artaxerxes Mnemon, follows.) *Darius Nothus*. 19, from Dec. 8, B.C. 424, to Dec. 3, B.C. 405; but he has not hitherto been met with on the monuments. In his 10th year Amyrtæus succeeded in establishing himself, and reigned in the Delta 6 years, when his son Pausiris was allowed to succeed him as viceroy. Or this may have been earlier, in B. C. 484.

Dyn. XXVIII of Manetho, with its one Saite king, Amyrtæus, and his six years, really contemporary and included within the 124 years of the Persians, is no doubt intended as a substitute for the anonymous Dyn. XXVII of the Chronicle with its 184 years, which have been accounted for by Manetho pretty nearly at their true chronological place, above Dyn. XVIII. The six unchronological years of his Dyn. XXVIII have been anticipated by us and inserted in their true place, in the early part of Dyn. XXVI, to which they belong by allusion. On the monuments *Amunrut*, i.e. Amyrtæus, occurs in conjunction with his throne-name; and the first part of the name of his son Pausiris, *Pef*. . . . and a throne-name read *Chebash*, which however Lepsius has not connected with Pausiris.

Dyn. XXIX of Manetho, like XXVII, has an unchronological addition of one year and 4 months, which any one

who saw merely that Dyn. XXVIII is not to be allowed to thrust up that of the Persians, might think intended to serve with the 4 odd months of XXVII as a patch to fill the void produced by drawing up the head of Dyn. XXVII to the 3rd instead of the 5th year of Cambyses, and so leaving the first two years of Artaxerxes Mnemon uncovered by it below. But the unchronological nature of all these dislocations of Manetho has been sufficiently explained already; and both this and other similar additions have been anticipated at the head of Dyn. XXVI. So, without further noticing the odd year and 4 months, Dyn. XXIX with 19 and Dyn. XXX with 38 years have together 57 years, the same number as Dynasties XXIX and XXX of the Chronicle, though their division in it is different, being into 39 and 18 years; and the 57 years will begin *really*, though not apparently, for both Manetho and the Chronicle alike, from Dec. 2, B. C. 402, and will also end for both alike simultaneously at Nov. 18, B. C. 345.

As regards the actual reigns of Manetho and the monuments, and the generations of the Chronicle, the monuments exhibit the names of

(Dyn. XXIX, Generation I, of the Chronicle, reign i.) *Naijsaurut*, Nephertites, with a throne-name like what is mentioned above as *Chebash*. If he had 6 years, they would be from Dec. 2, B. C. 402, to Dec. 1, B. C. 396.

(Generation II of the Chronicle, reign ii.) *Hakor*, Achoria. His 13 years would lie between Dec. 1, B. C. 396, and Nov. 28, B. C. 383, and would include the single year of Psammuthis consolidated by the Chronicle.

(Reign iii.) Some traces seemingly are given by Lepsius of *Psamtik IV.*, who is written in the list of Dyn. XXIX "Psammuthis," in like manner as Psamtik III. is written above in the lists of Dyn. XXVI. From Nov. 28, B. C. 384, to Nov. 28, B. C. 383?

(Reign iv.) Of *Nephertites II.* no trace has been found. His 4 months would no doubt be covered by the next reign as technically antedated. And it is to be remembered, that though we can only guess *where* the addition has been made, we *know* that one year and four months out of the twenty

years and four months given to this dynasty by Manetho are unchronological and fictitious.

(Generation III of Dyn. XXIX of the Chronicle, reign i. of Dyn. XXX of Manetho.) *Nect-hor-heb*, by some erroneously supposed to be the name of Amyrtæus; but really it is Nectanebo I., whose 18 years begin from Nov. 28, B. C. 383, and end Nov. 23, B. C. 365.

(Reign ii of Manetho's Dyn. XXX.) *Teos*, or *Tachos*, has not been found. His 2 years seem to reach from Nov. 23, B. C. 365, to Nov. 23, B. C. 363, and to belong to the 39 years of Dyn. XXIX in the Chronicle, though the reign would not be noticed as a separate generation.

(The single generation of Dyn. XXX of the Chronicle, reign iii of Manetho.) *Necht-nebef*, Nectanebo II., whose 18 years, antedated technically from Nov. 23, B. C. 363, and including the odd months of the reign of Tachos, end Nov. 18, B. C. 345, 15 years before the *cosmocracy* of Alexander.

Of the above seven kings of Manetho's lists, Nectanebo II., there can be no doubt, represents the single generation of Dyn. XXX of the Chronicle, and Nephertites II., with his 4 months, as certainly would be covered by the antedated accession of Nectanebo I., while the collective sum of the other reigns, as they now stand in the list of Africanus, needs a further reduction of one entire year to make it true and historical. On the other hand, the reigns of Nephertites I. with 6 years, of Achoris with 13, and of Nectanebo II. with 18, were probably both in the Chronicle and in reality distinct generations; and as the Chronicle cannot have made more than III generations in its Dyn. XXIX, the Shepherds of its Dyn. XXVII requiring IV, it seems to be *certain* that Psammuthis with 1 year, and Teos or Tachos with 2, were not alluded to as distinct generations by the Chronicle, and most probable, without being absolutely certain, that the 184 years of its anonymous Dynasty XXVII were really covered, as Manetho's lists indicate, by only *four* Shepherd kings.

After Dyn. XXX, the only point still remaining to be noticed is this, that Manetho, in the structure of his scheme above, has indicated the year B. C. 331 as the epoch to which

he meant by allusion to bring down his history, and from which he made the empire of Alexander and the Macedonians over Egypt to commence. For having found in the Chronicle the "443 years of the Cycle" lying between B.C. 305 and A.D. 139 thrown up, he threw up in like manner, and reduplicated, 978 more of the years of the Cycle, viz. all those which had passed from its commencement in B.C. 1322 to the end of the monarchy in B.C. 345. And of the 40 (now alone remaining) between Nectanebo and the Lagidæ, which had all been thrown up in effect, though unnamed, by the Chronicle, Manetho threw up only 14, so marking the interval between Nectanebo and Alexander. Thus he threw up the whole 1461 years of the current Cycle, all but 26, marking at once by this very fact, that 26 alone were not thrown up, the 26 years' interval between Alexander and the Lagidæ, and avoiding the incidental and partial admission of a cyclical element which was foreign to his scheme. At a later period, when the Macedonians were no longer in power to be complimented, and the memory of the last Persian government had become less odious by lapse of time, Ptolemy of Mendes made of the interval between Nectanebo II. and Alexander the last of a scheme of XXXI Dynasties, all of kings successors of Menes.

In conclusion, if we neglect the first 21 cycles or 30,681 nominal years of the Chronicle, as resolvable into the 2922 properly belonging to its XIII Gods, and if we further neglect the 341 fictitious years added to make all time seem to have run in cycles, the remainder of its years, being all full and real, amounting in number to $(2922 + 14 + 26 + 217 + 443 + 1881 =) 5503$ civil years, and lying ostensibly between Aug. 25, B.C. 5844, and Nov. 18, B.C. 345, but really and *chronologically* between April 26th, B.C. 5361, and July 20, A.D. 139, may be paralleled with the years of Manetho as follows, unchronological years and positions being printed in red:—

<i>Chronicle.</i>	{	30,000 years of the Sun (Dyn. I) + 681 + 900 +
<i>Manetho.</i>	{	 : 900 +
<i>Chron.</i>	{	2000 of XIII Gods (Dyn.
<i>Man.</i>	{	2000 [presented as 24,000] of . . Gods, Demi-

- Chron.* { II to XIV incl.) from April 26, B.C. 5361, to
Man. { gods and Manes from April 26, B.C. 5361, to
- Chron.* { May 2, B.C. 2463 + 22 of the same XIII Gods,
Man. { May 2, B.C. 2463 + 22 transferred from the Gods
- Chron.* { completing the first 2,922 years of human time in
Man. { of the Chronicle to Menes (Dyn. VIII of Manetho,
- Chron.* { two pseudo-cycles, commencing from May 2, B.C.
Man. { of viii Thinities, I of Africanus), from May 2, B.C.
- Chron.* { 2463, and terminating at April 26, B.C. 2441.
Man. { 2463, and terminating at April 26, B.C. 2441.

[Here the Chronicle inserts and adds to the XIII Gods 341 fictitious years, foreign to Manetho's scheme, in order to make time seem to have begun from a Sothic epoch, viz., from July 20, B.C. 5702, 341 years earlier than April 26, B.C. 5361.]

- Chron.* { + 14 past years "of the Cycle," really lying
Man. { + 14 past years "of the Cycle," really lying
- Chron.* { between Nov. 18, B.C. 345, and Nov. 15, B.C.
Man. { between Nov. 18, B.C. 345, and Nov. 15, B.C.
- Chron.* { 331, thrown up and added to the XIII Gods.
Man. { 331, thrown up and transferred to Menes, ending with the 36th year of the 253 of Dynasty VIII (I of Africanus). Thus, after seven mythological Dynasties, the *first* XXII and XIV, or in one sum the FIRST XXXVI YEARS of the First Dynasty of the kings in Manetho's Book I., indicate by their origin those two points in the true Egyptian chronology at which his historical narrative is made to begin and end, if one only sets aside all those years, $(14 + 443 + 978 =) 1435$ in number, which are originally "years of the Cycle current in Manetho's time," thrown up, or even thrown up *and* reduplicated, and which therefore, as interposed among other true years anterior to B.C. 1322, are plainly unchronological. So, *in terms of the true reckoning*, the reign of Menes is feigned to have begun from after the 2900th year of the Gods: that is, from

May 1, B.C. 2461, 236 years higher than in the Chronicle, and these 236 true and chronological years, falsely added to the monarchy, together with the 14 thrown up and marking the interval between the end of Manetho's last dynasty of kings and Alexander, and also the last historical date to which Manetho brings down his work, constitute together the 253 years of the first Dynasty of viii Thinite kings headed by Menes. It was no doubt in order to make the three sums 22, 14, and 217, go exactly into the dynasty, that Manetho not only increased by 6 decades the 190 years which the same dynasty has in the Chronicle, but also made the further remarkable addition of *three units*, really taken from the head of Dyn. XXVI, far below, and depressing everything below them, through nearly all the dynasties, till at length the void left by them is reached and filled.

Chron. { + 26 more *past* years of the Cycle, really lying
Man. { : — These 26 years are *not* thrown up by Ma-

Chron. { between Nov. 15, B.C. 331, and Nov. 8, B.C.
Man. { netho. If they had been, he would have re-

Chron. { 305, thrown up and added to the XIII Gods,
Man. { duplicated and thrown up the whole 1461 years

Chron. { together with the preceding 14, (the whole of the
Man. { of the Cycle current in his own time, which began

Chron. { forty years being purposely undescribed,) + 217
Man. { in B.C. 1322, and was to run out in A.D. 139. + 217

Chron. { of the VIII Demigods, making Dynasty XV (after
Man. { transferred to kings *ending with the 253rd and last*

Chron. { which follow xv dynasties of the kings) from
Man. { *year of Dynasty VIII (I of Africanus),* from

Chron. { April 26, B.C. 2441, to Feb. 3, B.C. 2224 + 443
Man. { April 26, B.C. 2441, to Feb. 3, B.C. 2224 + 443

Chron. { of the Cycle . . still future, . . . really
Man. { of the Cycle *partly* still future, partly past, really

Chron. { lying between Nov. 8, B.C. 305, and July 20,
Man. { lying between Nov. 8, B.C. 305, and July 20,

- Chron.* { A.D. 139, cast up in fifteen blank generations, not
Man. { A.D. 139, cast up and transferred to kings, mak-
- Chron.* { constituting any one of the thirty dynasties, nor
Man. { ing the 302 years of Dyn. IX (II of Africanus),
- Chron.* { given either to the Gods, or to the Demigods, or to
Man. { of ix Thinites, and the first 141 of X (III of Afri-
- Chron.* { mortal kings after Menes : — These years thrown
Man. { canus) of ix Memphites + 978 *past* years of the
- Chron.* { up by Manetho are absent from the Chronicle for
Man. { Cycle, from July 20, B.C. 1322, to Nov. 18, B.C.
- Chron.* { the same reason that the 341 inserted by the
Man. { 345, reduplicated and thrown up, as the Chronicle
- Chron.* { Chronicle for a cyclical purpose are absent from
Man. { had thrown up the other (40 + 443 =) 483 years
- Chron.* { Manetho, the author of the Chronicle having no
Man. { of the Cycle lying between Nov. 18, B.C. 345, and
- Chron.* { need of room in which to place concurrent lines of
Man. { July 20, A.D. 139. These 978 years make the
- Chron.* { kings, any more than Manetho had need of that
Man. { remaining 73 of Dyn. X (III of Africanus), the
- Chron.* { precise number of 341 years which would make
Man. { 277 of Dyn. XI (IV of Africanus), the 248 of Dyn.
- Chron.* { time to have run in cycles from the beginning.
Man. { XII (V of Africanus), the 197 of Dyn. XIII (VI
of Africanus), the 59 of Dyn. XIV (XI of Afri-
canus), concluding Book I. of Manetho, and lastly the first
124 years of Dyn. XV (XII of Africanus) in Book II.
- Chron.* { + the first 22 + 14 or together the first
Man. { + the FIRST XXII + XIV or together the FIRST
- Chron.* { 36 years of the monarchy, viz., of the viii Ta-
Man. { XXXVI YEARS of the monarchy, according to true
- Chron.* { nite generations, headed by Menes, with 190 years.
Man. { consecutive chronology, indicated by the remain-
der of *thirty-six* years included in and ending the
160 of Dyn. XV (XII of Africanus.) The same number

XXXVI, composed of 22 of the Gods and 14 of the Cycle, marking the beginning and the end of Manetho's historical narrative, having been already noticed at the head of Manetho's whole series, chronological or unchronological, of kings in connection with the name and epoch of Menes, its repetition here, at the true epoch of Menes according to the Chronicle, is no doubt a covert indication that here, at this point, Manetho makes as it were a new beginning; and they who would distinguish the true chronological series of years (however it may be in places dislocated by suppressions and compensations), must reckon from hence, as if Menes had been set at the 36th year before the end of Dyn. XV (XII of Africanus). And accordingly, taking this hint, and reckoning from hence, we find that there follow in all *fifteen* dynasties, and 1881 years to the end of the fifteenth and last of them, which, it is needless to say, is precisely the number of dynasties and precisely the number of years given by the Chronicle to the Egyptian monarchy from Menes to Nectanebo II.

And we can see a certain parallelism between the commencement of Manetho's Book I. or of that portion of it which contained dynasties of kings and years chiefly unchronological, and this covert *recommencement* in Book II. indicating the true chronological series of the history. As the first regal dynasty of Book I., with the number *thirty-six* at its head, was made to contain the remainder of the true years of the Gods and Demigods transferred to kings, while ($443 + 978 =$) 1421 fictitious years "of the Cycle" thrown up, or 1297 of them, were to follow in six more dynasties to the end of Book I.,—so in commencing Book II., its first dynasty (Manetho's eighth of kings, fifteenth of the XXX) is made to unite the remainder, viz. 124, of the fictitious years of the Cycle thrown up with a commencement of *thirty-six* of those true and historical years of the monarchy which were to follow after it in all the rest of Book II. and in Book III., and which were to be identical in their number, 1881, and parallel in their number of *fifteen* dynasties, with the 1881 years and *fifteen* dynasties given by the Chronicle to the kings from Menes to Nectanebo II. So the ($36 + 217 =$) 253 of Dyn. VIII (I of Africanus), and the ($124 + 36 =$) 160 of Dyn.

XV (XII of Africanus) are analogous to one another and symmetrical, in Books I. and II.

Chron. { The *first* 36 years of Menes and the Monarchy
Man. { The *last* 36 years of Dyn. XV (XII of Afric.),

Chron. { reaching from Feb. 3, B.C. 2224, to Feb. 22, B.C.
Man. { reaching from Feb. 3, B.C. 2224, to Feb. 22, B.C.

Chron. { 2188, + the remaining 154 of the 190 of Dyn.
Man. { 2188, + the first . . . 154 of the 184 of Dyn.

Chron. { XVI of the viii earliest Tanite kings, from Feb. 22,
Man. { XVI (XIV of Africanus) of Xoites, from Feb. 22,

Chron. { B.C. 2188, to Jan. 14, B.C. 2034, + 103 viz. the
Man. { B.C. 2188, to Jan. 14, B.C. 2034, + 103 viz. the

Chron. { whole continuance of the second sovereign dynasty
Man. { last 30 of Dyn. XVI (XIV of Africanus), and

Chron. { of kings, being Dyn. XVII of
Man. { the first 73 of Dyn. XVII (XV Africanus) of

Chron. { iv Memphites, from Jan. 14, B.C. 1034, to Dec.
Man. { vi Shepherds, from Jan. 14, B.C. 1034, to Dec.

Chron. { 20, B.C. 1932. + [184 of iv Shepherd kings
Man. { 20, B.C. 1932. + 184 of vi Shepherds, from

Chron. { transposed, so as to stand unchronologically as
Man. { the 73rd to the 257th of the 259 years 10^m. of

Chron. { Dyn. XXVII in the Chronicle, from Dec. 20,
Man. { Dyn. XVII (XV of Africanus), from Dec. 20,

Chron. { B.C. 1932, to Nov. 4, B.C. 1748] : ——— The 2
Man. { B.C. 1932, to Nov. 4, B.C. 1748. + 2.10^m. *un-*

Chron. { years and 10 months of Manetho, if reckoned here
Man. { *chronologically occurring here* at the end of Dyn.

Chron. { as chronological, would depress the head of Dyn.
Man. { XVII (XV of Africanus,) but needed as compen-

Chron. { XVIII and all the dates below, until their effect
Man. { sation for years and months suppressed before

Chron. { were compensated by some unchronological sup-
Man. { Dyn. XXVI. These 2 years and 10 months have

- Chron.* { pression. But it is best not to let them count
Man. { originated in an addition of three units to Dyn.
- Chron.* { here, so as to destroy the manifest identity and
Man. { VIII (I of Africanus), made to obtain for it that
- Chron.* { parallelism of the $348 + 194 = 542$ and $333 + 209$
Man. { commencement, and for Dyn. XV (XII of Afric.),
- Chron.* { = 542 years of the two following Dynasties XVIII
Man. { that remainder of (XXII + XIV =) XXXVI years which
- Chron.* { and XIX of the Chronicle and Manetho. In this
Man. { has been noticed above. That there is now a frac-
- Chron.* { and other similar cases the unchronological surplus
Man. { tion of 10^m. and another of 2^m. corresponding to
- Chron.* { years or months must be only carried to account as
Man. { it below in the sum of Dynasties XXVI, XXVII,
- Chron.* { compensation available for filling voids below.
Man. { and XXIX, may perhaps be owing to the way in
which our reconstruction has been obtained,
namely, by patches, partly from the lists of Africanus, and
partly from the original Manetho of Josephus.
- Chron.* { + the first 165 years of the 348 of the xiv "Mem-
Man. { + the first 165 years of the 333 of the xvi "Dios-
- Chron.* { phites" of Dynasty XVIII, from November 4,
Man. { polites" of Dynasty XVIII, from November 4,
- Chron.* { B.C. 1748, to Sept. 24, B.C. 1583. + 15 years of the
Man. { B.C. 1748, to Sept. 24, B.C. 1583. : — suppressed
- Chron.* { Sun-worshippers, from September 24, B.C. 1583,
Man. { by Manetho, but compensated by an addition
- Chron.* { to September 23, B.C. 1568. + the remaining 165
Man. { of 15 prefixed to Dyn. XIX. + the remaining 165
- Chron.* { years of the 348 of Dyn. XVIII, from Sept. 23.
Man. { years of the 333 of Dyn. XVIII, from Sept. 23.
- Chron.* { B.C. 1568, to Aug. 9, B.C. 1400. : — not histo-
Man. { B.C. 1568, to Aug. 9, B.C. 1400. + 15 prefixed to
- Chron.* { rical, nor to be found in this place in the Chronicle,
Man. { Dynasty XIX, in lieu of 15 suppressed above.

- Chron.* { + the 194, i.e. the whole continuance of the v Dios-
Man. { + the 194 remaining of the 209 of the vii Dios-
Chron. { polites of Dyn. XIX, from Aug. 9, B.C. 1400, to
Man. { polites of Dyn. XIX, from Aug. 9, B.C. 1400, to
Chron. { June 23, B.C. 1206. + 135 of the 228 of viii
Man. { June 23, B.C. 1206. + 135 [of vii?] of the xii
Chron. { Diospolites of Dyn. XX, from June 23, B.C. 1206,
Man. { Diospolites of Dyn. XX, from June 23, B.C. 1206,
Chron. { to May 19, B.C. 1071. + the last 93 of the 228
Man. { to May 19, B.C. 1071. + the first 93 of the 130
Chron. { years of the viii Diospolites of Dyn. XX, (with
Man. { of [iv of?] the vii Tanites . . of Dyn. XXI, (with,
Chron. { a separate and contemporaneous line of Tanite
Man. { the last iv or v of the xii Diospolites of Dyn.
Chron. { kings, perhaps reigning in the Delta,) . from
Man. { XX reigning contemporaneously at Thebes), from
Chron. { May 19, B.C. 1071, to April 25, B.C. 978. : —
Man. { May 19, B.C. 1071, to April 25, B.C. 978. + 37,
Chron. { absent here from the Chronicle, but found in 37
Man. { viz. the last 37 of the 130 *years* (also three of the
Chron. { years suppressed by Manetho below + 1, viz. the
Man. { vii Tanite *kings*) of Dyn. XXI. . : — absent
Chron. { first year of the 121 of the vi Tanite genera-
Man. { from Manetho, but covered by 1 of the 37 unchro-
Chron. { tions of Dynasty XXI, extending from April 25,
Man. { nological years of his Dyn. XXI, from April 25,
Chron. { B.C. 978, to April 25, B.C. 977 + the remaining
Man. { B.C. 978, to April 25, B.C. 977 + the whole. .
Chron. { 120 of the vi Tanites of Dyn. XXI, from April
Man. { 120 of the ix Bubastites of Dyn. XXII, from April
Chron. { 25, B.C. 977, to March 26, B.C. 857. + the whole
Man. { 25, B.C. 977, to March 26, B.C. 857. + the first
Chron. { 48 years belonging to the iii Tanites of Dynasty
Man. { 48 years of the 89 of the iv Tanites of Dynasty

- Chron.* { XXII, identical with the last three of the ix
Man. { XXIII. (Really these 48 belong to the last three
- Chron.* { Bubastites of Manetho's Dynasty XXII, not to
Man. { of the ix Bubastites of his Dyn. XXII, and are
- Chron.* { Petubast, who is either a contemporary or else put
Man. { to be transferred to them from the names
- Chron.* { up out of his true place, from March 26, B.C.
Man. { Petubast and Osorchon), from March 26, B.C.
- Chron.* { 875, to March 14, B.C. 809, + 19 years, (being the
Man. { 875, to March 14, B.C. 809, + 19 more of the 89
- Chron.* { whole sum) of the ii Diospolites of Dyn. XXIII,
Man. { of the iv Tanites of Dyn. XXIII, viz. 9 to be
- Chron.* { who are identifiable with Osorchon and Psammous
Man. { brought up and given to Osorchon from the 31 of
- Chron.* { in Dynasty XXIII of Manetho, Petubast being
Man. { Zet, and 10 of Psammous, (22 years being left
- Chron.* { put up to carry years not belonging to him,
Man. { to Zet to divide with Petubast, as put down,)
- Chron.* { from March 14, B.C. 809, to March 9, B.C. 790, + 28,
Man. { from March 14, B.C. 809, to March 9, B.C. 790, + 28,
- Chron.* { viz. the . . . first 28 of the 44 of Dyn. XXIV
Man. { viz. the remaining 22 of the 89 of Dyn. XXIII
- Chron.* { of the *three* Saïtes identified with Petubast and
Man. { belonging to the kings Petubast and Zet together,
- Chron.* { Zet of Manetho's Dyn. XXIII, and Bocchoris
Man. { and the 6 of a third, the *single* Saïte Bocchoris,
- Chron.* { of his XXIV, from March 9, B.C. 790, to
Man. { of Dyn. XXIV, from March 9, B.C. 790, to
- Chron.* { March 2, B.C. 762, + 16, viz. the remainder of the
Man. { March 2, B.C. 762.: — These 16 are suppressed by
- Chron.* { 44 of Dyn. XXIV, from March 2, B.C. 762, to
Man. { Manetho, but compensated by 16 of his unchron-
- Chron.* { Feb. 26, B.C. 746. + 40 of the 44 of the iii
Man. { logical years above. + 40 of the iii

- Chron.* { Ethiopians of Dynasty XXV, from February
Man. { Ethiopians of Dynasty XXV, from February
- Chron.* { 26, B. C. 746, to February 16, B. C. 706, + 4
Man. { 26, B. C. 746, to February 16, B. C. 706, : —
- Chron.* { remaining of the 44 of Dynasty XXV, from
Man. { These 4 are suppressed by Manetho, but
- Chron.* { February 16, B. C. 706, to February 15, B. C.
Man. { compensated by 4 of his unchronological years
- Chron.* { 702, + 19, being the first 19 of the 177 of the
Man. { above : — These 19 are suppressed by Manetho,
- Chron.* { vii "Memphite" generations of Dyn. XXVI,
Man. { but compensated by 19 of his unchronological
- Chron.* { probably to the death of Tirhakah, from Feb. 15,
Man. { years inserted *above*, in the latter part of his
- Chron.* { B. C. 702, to Feb. 11, B. C. 683; + 8 more of the
Man. { interpolated Dynasty XXI . : — These 8 are
- Chron.* { 177 of Dyn. XXVI, commencing from Feb. 11,
Man. { suppressed by Manetho, but compensated by 8
- Chron.* { B. C. 683, and extending to Jan. 15, B. C. 675.
Man. { of his unchronological years inserted *below*.
- Chron.* { + 12 more of the 177 of Dyn. XXVI (making
Man. { + 12, being the first 12 of the 150, 6^m. of the ix
- Chron.* { 49 in all, to the end of its 2nd generation), to the
Man. { Saïtes of Dyn. XXVI, reaching, in truth, to the
- Chron.* { accession of Psammitichus I., Jan. 12, B. C. 663 :
Man. { end of the 3rd name or generation of the ix, the
three first of whom really *could* only have 12, not
21, of the 150 years, there being certainly as many as 138
after the accession of Psammitichus I. But the first three
names really cover also the preceding 27 years suppressed:
- Chron.* { from Jan. 15, B. C. 675, to Jan. 12, B. C. 663 +
Man. { from Jan. 15, B. C. 675, to Jan. 12, B. C. 663 +
- Chron.* { 138 remaining of the 177 years of Dyn.
Man. { 138 of the remaining 150 years and 6^m. of Dyn.

- Chron.* { XXVI, from the accession of Psammitichus I,
Man. { XXVI, from the accession of Psammitichus I,
- Chron.* { Jan. 12, B.C. 663, to a little before the death of
Man. { Jan. 12, B.C. 663, to a little before the death of
- Chron.* { Amasis, and the commencement of the 5th Persian
Man. { Amasis, and the commencement of the 5th Persian
- Chron.* { year of Cambyses, Jan. 2, B.C. 525, + 184 of the
Man. { year of Cambyses, Jan. 2, B.C. 528 : — These
- Chron.* { iv(?) generations of the anonymous Dyn. XXVII,
Man. { 184 years, with the names of the Shepherds, are
- Chron.* { which have been restored above to their true
Man. { given by Manetho exactly in their true chrono-
- Chron.* { place, so as to precede the kings of Dynasty
Man. { logical place, in his Dyn. XVII (Dyn. XV of
- Chron.* { XVIII : — Absent from the Chronicle, really
Man. { Africanus + 6 months, the last of Dyn. XXVII,
- Chron.* { covered by the first year of its Dyn. XXVIII of
Man. { really contained in the Egyptian reign of Cam-
- Chron.* { the Persians, antedated from Thoth 1 of the 5th
Man. { byses, as antedated from the beginning of his 5th
- Chron.* { of Cambyses, + 124 of the v Persians of Dyn.
Man. { Persian year, + 124 of the viii Persians of Dyn.
- Chron.* { XXVIII, from the beginning of the 5th of Cam-
Man. { XXVII, from the beginning of the 5th of Cam-
- Chron.* { byses to the end of the 2nd of Artaxerxes
Man. { byses to the end of the 2nd of Artaxerxes
- Chron.* { Mnemon, these last two years being consolidated
Man. { Mnemon, the last 2 years being unchronologi-
- Chron.* { in the v generations of the Chronicle, from
Man. { cally forced up, and given to Cambyses, from
- Chron.* { Jan. 2, B.C. 528, to Dec. 2, B.C. 402. : — Absent
Man. { Jan. 2, B.C. 528, to Dec. 2, B.C. 402. + 4 months
- Chron.* { from the Chronicle], as being really covered
Man. { unchronologically added to Dyn. XXVII, telling

- Chron.* { by the first year of the next dynasty : — Absent
Man. { in compensation of suppressions above + 6 years
- Chron.* { from the Chronicle ; being a substitute for its
Man. { also unchronological, constituting with one name,
- Chron.* { anonymous Dyn. XXVII + 19 of the 39 years
Man. { Amyrtæus, Dyn. XXVIII + 19 of the 21. 1^m.
- Chron.* { of the iii Tanites of Dyn. XXIX, from
Man. { of the iv Mendesians of Dyn. XXIX, from
- Chron.* { Dec. 2, B.C. 402, to Nov. 28, B.C. 383 : — Ab-
Man. { Dec. 2, B.C. 402, to Nov. 28, B.C. 383 + 1. 4^m.
- Chron.* { sent from the Chronicle, the whole year and the
Man. { unchronologically added to Dyn. XXIX, telling
- Chron.* { 4^m. being all equally unchronological. + 38, being
Man. { towards compensations needed above, + 38, being
- Chron.* { the last 20 of the iii Tanites of Dyn. XXIX,
Man. { the . . 38 of the iii
- Chron.* { and the 18 of the single Tanite of Dyn. XXX,
Man. { Sebennytes of Dyn. XXX,
- Chron.* { from Nov. 28, B.C. 383, to Nov. 23, B.C. 363, and
Man. { from Nov. 28, B.C. 383, to Nov. 23, B.C. 363, and
- Chron.* { Nov. 18, B.C. 345. + 14 [+ 1 = 15] years on to the
Man. { Nov. 18, B.C. 345. + 14 years to Alexander, (Nov.
- Chron.* { *Cosmocracy* of Alexander, viz. Nov. 15, B.C. 330,
Man. { 15, B.C. 331,) these 14 being alluded to, but not
- Chron.* { these 15 years being alluded to perhaps by the
Man. { contained, in the 3555 years of Manetho's kings.
- Chron.* { text of the Chronicle, but not distinguished in the
 structure of the scheme itself, nor contained in its 1881 years
 of kings, nor in its whole period of 35,525 years.

The scheme of 48,863 years, preserved by Diogenes La-
 ertius, having no intermixture of fictitious or unchronological
 years, but only its round month of cycles, viz. $(30 \times 1461 =)$
 43,830 cosmical rather than nominal years, prefixed, all its
 remaining years, being 5033 in number, and divisible into
 $2922 + 217 + 1881 + 13$, or into $900 + 2000 + 22 + 217 + 5$

14 + 1845 + 13, to Alexander, are strictly chronological, and need no separate comparison to parallel them with the true and chronological years either of the Chronicle or of Manetho, to the foregoing exhibition of which they afford the strongest and the most satisfactory confirmation.

THE EGYPTIAN DYNASTIES OF MANETHO.

1. Few persons would probably hesitate to admit that if we possessed the chronological work of Manetho in its original form, we should have information on which we could reasonably depend as to the duration of each Egyptian dynasty, and as to the interval between its commencement and a fixed point of time, for at least as far back as the expulsion of the Hyk-Shôs. On the other hand, few persons would venture to assert that any of the lists of kings, with the durations of their respective reigns, which have been handed down to us as those of Manetho, can be depended on as really his. The discrepancy which everywhere exists between these lists appears to most persons a sufficient reason for rejecting the authority of them all. This being the case, it becomes a question, whether any certainty is attainable in respect to Egyptian chronology. It is vain to appeal to the monuments. I do not say this with reference to the scepticism which still exists as to there being *any* monumental evidence which can be depended on as properly interpreted. Scepticism like this can only exist where the grounds of hieroglyphical interpretation have not been properly investigated. I say however, advisedly, that we do not yet possess, and that it is extremely unlikely that we ever shall possess, such monumental evidence as would enable us to construct a chronological canon.

2. The chronological value of the evidence which we possess is extremely small. The Egyptian kings dated their public acts, not from any fixed epoch, but by the years of their respective reigns. In a few instances the interval between events which occurred in recorded regnal years of different kings is recorded also; and when this is the case we can compute the interval between their accessions. We know in this manner that Ahmôs the Saite came to the throne forty years after Nekau, and Pemi fifty-two years after Shishonk III. In a few other instances, where the reign of a king overlapped that of his successor, and where the regnal years of both the existing kings are recorded together, the interval between their accessions can also be determined. In this manner I ascertained, many years ago, that the first year of T'usortasen II. was the thirty-third of his father, Amen-em-hè II.; and that the first year of the latter was the forty-third of his grandfather, T'usortasen I., whom he succeeded. The number of cases, however, in which intervals between the commencement of reigns can be determined with accuracy by either of these methods is so extremely small, when

compared with the entire number of reigns, as, in place of encouraging us to hope for ultimate success in constructing a perfect canon, to lead us to despair of even approximating to its construction.

3. In a few instances, but a few only, genealogies exist which link together by a known number of generations an earlier and a later reign. We have it on record, for example, that in the thirty-seventh year of Shishonk IV., which must have been one of the very last years of the twenty-second dynasty, a tablet was erected by a person who was ninth in descent from Shishonk I., the founder of the dynasty. Assuming that Osorkon I., his ancestor in the eighth degree, was of the same age when his father became king as he himself was when he erected the tablet, the duration of the dynasty would be exactly measured by eight generations; and it could not be very much more or very much less than this.^a There is, I believe, no instance in Egyptian history where a genealogical tablet gives such good chronological evidence as this; and yet how far is this from giving us accurate information! The dynasty lasted "*about* eight generations;" how many years should that be reckoned to be? In English history a generation has been on an average about 32 years. Between the birth of William the Conqueror and that of Queen Victoria, the twenty-fifth in descent from him, 792 years intervened. At this rate eight generations would occupy 253½ years. In ancient times and in eastern countries the average was less. The interval between the births of Rehoboam and Jeconiah, the sixteenth in descent from him, was about 416 years, giving 208 for the eight generations. The highest sum of eight consecutive generations in the line of Rehoboam is 244 years, the lowest, 195. The genealogy to which I have referred may be regarded as conclusive against those who, relying on the statements attributed to Manetho by Julius Africanus, make the duration of this dynasty only 120 or even 116 years; and it harmonizes well with the reading "202 years," which I will hereafter shew to have been what Manetho really made it; but I would not venture to rely on this genealogy as conclusive against the views of Lepsius and Bunsen, who, with the knowledge of what it contains, have assigned to the dynasty 174 and 176 years respectively. We may assume 25 years as a probable average for a generation;

^a That Shishonk I. was not a very young man when he obtained the kingdom, and that Osorkon his son had then attained to man's estate, are evident from the monumentally-recorded fact (Nile statue, British Museum) that Osorkon, and not Shishonk himself, married the daughter of Psusennes, the last king of the twenty-first dynasty.

but even if the length of the dynasty had been accurately, instead of approximately, measured by eight generations, a large margin must be allowed on each side within which it might range without being decidedly at variance with what is stated in the genealogical inscription.

4. Neither is the evidence to be obtained from regnal dates to be implicitly relied on. Some persons seem to have thought that a chronological canon might be constructed by counting the highest regnal years of the successive kings which occur in the dates of tablets. But, on the one hand, we can never be sure that the highest date found is the highest that may have existed. The highest regnal year, for example, which has been found for Shishonk III. is his twenty-ninth year; and yet there is evidence, to which I have already adverted (§ 2), that he reigned fifty-two. On the other hand, in such cases of joint reigns as I have mentioned in the latter part of § 2, it is manifest that if the highest regnal years of all the kings were to be taken as the lengths of their reigns, the years in which two sovereigns reigned together would be counted twice over. Nor have we any right to assume that cases of this kind were few in number, or that the durations of these joint reigns were always small. There is a stèle at Leyden (V., 4) which has the double date of the forty-fourth year of T'usortasen I. and the second of Amen-em-hè II. There is another tablet (Sharpe, i., 83) which appears to be dated in the following year, the third of Amen-em-hè II. No second date accompanies this, but king T'usortasen I. is mentioned in the body of the inscription, and his name is followed by the addition "May he live!" which characterizes living kings; while his father's name has the usual addition "who hath spoken truth (or been justified)," which is characteristic of the dead. In this instance I suppose no one would question that T'usortasen I. was still alive; yet in a similar instance in the twenty-second dynasty, the validity of this conclusion is strenuously denied. In the Karnac inscription (Lepsius' *Auswahl*, 15) dated in the eleventh year of Takelut, king Osorkon, the grandfather of his wife, and, as I take it, his own father, is mentioned with the very same addition "May he live!" I shall have to return to the consideration of this clause (see § 57). I will only remark here, that it is at least possible that king Osorkon was actually alive in the eleventh year after his son had begun to reign in conjunction with him; nor should I be surprised at the discovery of a document dated during these eleven years, bearing the names and years of both the kings, or the name and year of Osorkon alone.

5. Another source of error in computation by regnal years

is the possible existence of double epochs at which reigns may be reckoned to commence. There may be cases in Egyptian history analogous to what occurred in the time of James I., or Charles II. In the former instance, a king who had reigned for sixteen years in Scotland from his mother's death, became king of England, and reigned over both countries for twenty-two years more. A chronologer who, possessing no historical information, should take as his guide dated documents only, might discover from English documents that the first year of Charles I. was only twenty-two years after the first of James I., and might come to the blundering conclusion that the reign of Mary of Scotland terminated when that of Elizabeth really terminated. This hypothesis would, of course, destroy the earlier synchronisms between Scottish and English history; and it might then occur to our supposed chronologer that the best way of setting matters straight would be to strike off twenty years or so from the long reign of Elizabeth. Absurd as this mode of proceeding must appear to persons acquainted with English and Scottish history, its absurdity would not appear to one who had only a few detached documents before him, relating to private affairs, although dated by regnal years. What I have supposed that this chronologer might have done is exactly parallel to what our best Egyptologists have done. A document is discovered which proves that the reign of Tirhaka as king of *Egypt* (reckoning from the death of Seti III.) was only twenty-seven years before the first of Psamitik I.; the false inference is drawn that his reign as king of *Ethiopia* (reckoning from the death of Shebetok, which was fourteen years earlier) began twenty-seven years only before that of Psamitik I. The consequence of this false inference is, that the conquest of Egypt by Shebek is made to fall a good many years after the conquest of Samaria; and as Hoshea, the last king of Samaria, is said to have made an alliance with Shebek, the anachronism thus produced is removed, not (as it ought to have been) by adding to the Egyptian chronology the fourteen years which had been improperly omitted, but by striking off twenty years from the reign of Manasseh of Judah, which is considered sufficiently long to admit of this reduction! It goes for nothing with the gentlemen who have made this *correction*, forsooth, of Egyptian chronology, that in the second book of Kings, Tirhaka is called king of Cush, or Ethiopia, a "Pharaoh king of Egypt" being spoken of as his cotemporary; that Herodotus speaks of Sethos as king of Egypt when Sennacherib invaded Palestine, and that Sennacherib himself speaks of having for his adversaries "kings of Egypt and the king of Ethiopia." All these proofs that the

invasion of Sennacherib took place while Tirhaka was king of Ethiopia, and before he had become king of Egypt, are disregarded; and to meet the supposed exigency of an Egyptian regnal date, Jewish, Assyrian, and Babylonian chronologies are all recklessly violated.

6. The other occasion in English history which I mentioned as what might give rise to a chronological blunder, is the reign of Charles II. Counting from the death of his father, from which he reckoned his regnal years, to his own death, he reigned thirty-six years; but in reality he began to reign in what he called his fourteenth year, thirteen years having belonged to the Commonwealth. So far as respects chronology, it does not matter whether the interval between the deaths of father and son be counted as thirty-six years of Charles II., or as thirteen years of the Commonwealth and twenty-three of Charles II.; but it would be a serious chronological error, into which however a person would be very likely to fall who had only detached regnal years to guide him, if this interval were counted as thirteen years of the Commonwealth and thirty-six of Charles II. Some instances are certainly to be met with in Egyptian history in which a chronologer would be likely to commit an error analogous to this; but I will not enter on the discussion of them here. I have said, I believe, quite enough to shew that the evidence furnished by the Egyptian monuments is quite insufficient for the construction of a chronological system. It may accredit, or it may shew the worthlessness of, dynastic lists—it may verify, or it may overturn, a chronological system otherwise constructed; but *of itself* it can produce nothing that can be relied on.

7. This being the case, it is evident that if a correct chronology of the Egyptian dynasties can be obtained at all, it must be obtained from the dynastic lists attributed to Manetho; a comparison of which in their present state of corruption may enable us to discover what Manetho really wrote. The problem to be solved is this:—Given the durations assigned to the dynasties and reigns by Africanus and Eusebius, and to the dynasties by the compiler of the Old Chronicle; to recover by legitimate criticism the durations originally assigned to them by Manetho himself; from which all the existing documents have been derived by misconceptions of Manetho's meaning, blundering attempts at correcting his supposed errors, and *subsequently to these*, deliberate falsifications, with a view to bring lists which appeared to be inconsistent with the received Biblical chronology into harmony with it. I believe that I have completely solved this problem. In the present article I give the durations

of the dynasties according to the restored text of Manetho, with such explanations as are necessary to the correct understanding of his chronological system; and I then gave the synchronisms by which the correctness of my restoration is, as I conceive, established. In a subsequent article it is my intention to fill up the outline which I have here drawn, by giving a restoration of the durations assigned to the several reigns by Manetho. In the meantime it is my wish that what I now publish should undergo the most searching criticism.

8. It will be observed that I go no further back than to the commencement of the eighteenth dynasty. Manetho himself, as will be seen, marks this as a point of chronological departure; and the data by which, as I conceive, his text can be confidently restored back to this point, fail as to earlier dynasties. I ought to remark also that I carefully distinguish in my investigation between two things which some enquirers have confounded, namely, the true chronology of the period, and the chronology of it according to the mind of Manetho. I have, in the first instance, sought to discover the latter, using no other data than the three corrupt lists which I have mentioned, and those Greek writings which guided those who prepared them in their corruptions. Thus my restoration of the text of Manetho stands *absolutely independent of Egyptian monumental evidence*. And yet it can scarcely be doubted that Manetho had correct information with respect to the period in question, and that even when he thought it necessary to deviate from historical truth, he adhered strictly to chronological truth. I mean to say that, though he might misrepresent *facts* in a manner analogous to that of an English historian, who, ignoring the Commonwealth, ascribed thirty-six years to Charles II. of England as his reign *de facto*, he always in his summaries of the reigns in the dynasties gave the correct sums; so that the commencements of the several dynasties are all truly given. Hence the synchronisms, by which I shew that the dates according to my system are correctly given, are evidences also of the correctness of my restorations of Manetho's text.

9. The restoration that I have given is, as I have said, wholly independent of Egyptian monumental evidence. I have, however, tested it as well as I could by this last; and I am not aware of a single fact, nor do I believe that any exists, which is established by monumental evidence, and yet inconsistent with my system. This is, however, a matter on which I challenge the most searching criticism. If any such supposed fact be produced, either in the April number of this Journal or in a private letter to myself, and if I cannot shew that the person

who produces it is mistaken in supposing it either to be established by monumental evidence or to be inconsistent with my restored chronology, I will admit that, however plausible my restoration may be, it is unsound. I have no expectation, however, that this will be the case; and I hope that in the July number I shall be able to give, together with a triumphant reply to my assailants, if any, a restoration of the duration of the reigns in the dynasties as originally given by Manetho. I hold this in reserve, until my restoration of the duration of the dynasties be sufficiently tested.

10. Let it be observed, however, that it is to *facts* alone that I will surrender my opinion. *Authority* will have no weight with me. I am perfectly well aware that almost all Egyptologists support a chronological system which is altogether opposed to mine. They think that the accession of Rehoboam to the throne of Judah, and that of Shishonk to the throne of Egypt, which almost immediately preceded it, took place considerably after the time assigned to them in the margins of our *tables*; and in this Sir Henry Rawlinson and Mr. Bosanquet agree with them. And they refer the exodus to the latter part of the nineteenth dynasty. I maintain, on the contrary, and I think demonstrate, that the accessions of Shishonk and Rehoboam were in 980 and 979 B.C.; and that consequently no curtailment of the reign of any of the kings of Judah is admissible; nor any such arrangement of the Persian reigns as Mr. Bosanquet proposes. I shew also that the Egyptian reign, in which Egyptologists place the exodus, did not commence till about 250 years before the death of Solomon! By *me* the exodus is placed at a far earlier period. This great diversity between my views and those which are generally entertained, renders it a matter of course that quotations from various eminent Egyptologists can be produced *ad libitum*, expressing opinions which, if taken as standards of truth, would prove me to be in error. Such quotations, however, being mere expressions of opinion, have not the slightest weight with me. Unless some monumentally-recorded fact can be produced, which is inconsistent with my chronological arrangement of the dynasties, I shall continue to hold that its inconsistency with the opinions of Egyptologists is no proof whatever that *it* is wrong; the fact being that the inconsistent opinions of Egyptologists are wrong. Again, as respects Sir Henry Rawlinson's canon. This is not a cotemporary document, but a compilation made by an unknown person in the reign of Assur-bani-bal. Its inconsistency with my restoration of Manetho, supported as this is by recorded astronomical observations, proves that the compiler of the canon was a blunderer;

•

and that the early dates which it is supposed to give are incorrect. Again, as to the Astronomer Royal, while I would cheerfully submit to him our astronomical questions generally, I except the two questions, which are linked together, of the date of the Medo-Lyidian war, and the magnitude of the moon's acceleration. I protest against any argument against my restoration which may be drawn from its inconsistency with his notions, that the Medo-Lyidian war was terminated by the eclipse of 585 B.C., and that the coefficient of T^2 in the mean elongation of the moon, was $12''.192$, as Hansen makes it, or even more. On the contrary, I appeal to the monumentally-recorded eclipse, which I shall bring forward as furnishing *conclusive evidence* that the coefficient of T^2 is much less than this, and consequently that the moon's shadow in the eclipse of 585 B.C. could not have passed where the Astronomer Royal supposes that it did.

11. It is to facts monumentally recorded alone that I will yield; and if any one brings forward facts which he may conceive to be at variance with my views, I have to request that he will quote the precise fact monumentally recorded. There is very great temptation to quote, as a monumentally-recorded fact, what is not really so, but an inference from one; the suppressed premise of the enthymeme being one, of which the person who has drawn the inference has no doubt, but of which others may entertain very great doubts, which, in short, they may regard as positively erroneous. The extent to which this error has been committed by Egyptologists is really surprising. References to the evidence quoted should also be precise.

12. One word more of preliminary matter. The views put forward in this paper are not, so far as I am aware, held by any one but myself. Some of them I expressed so long ago as in March, 1856. See the *Literary Gazette* for that year, p. 111. I advanced further in a paper in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* for October, 1858, p. 126; and still further in a paper in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* for 1861, vol. xviii., p. 378. In all these papers, while I was in the right direction and gradually approaching the truth, I admitted errors which kept me from attaining to it. My views are now matured. I have succeeded in completely removing the inconsistencies which, though they only introduced errors of small amount, disfigured my former papers. I have produced an arrangement of the dynasties which will, I flatter myself, be found to *run on all fours*; my former one, though much to be preferred to any that had been previously produced, *limping* in more places than one. As respects the medium through which I publish this restoration of Mane-

tho, I think a weekly journal would be objectionable; as in it I could not publish at once the entire of my system, so far as respects the dynasties, with the proofs of its truth. *The Journal of Sacred Literature* seems to be preferable to that of the Royal Asiatic Society, because the subject is closely connected with sacred literature; the chronology of the Israelites in Palestine, and particularly that of their kings, is as much my subject of discussion as that of the Egyptian dynasties; and the views of the early Christians as to Israelitish chronology have to be taken into account as an important means of restoring the corrupt text of Manetho.

13. The mode of proceeding by which I restore the original dynastic durations of Manetho includes a double criticism. These were depraved in the first instance by blundering Egyptian or Greek writers, who looked no farther than Manetho, and whose successive depravations of his numbers were the result of misapprehensions of his meaning in the first instance, and of injudicious attempts at restoring a text which they perceived to be faulty, at a subsequent period. Three texts were thus formed, which I will call A, B, and C, the last of them being the production of a person who had the two former before him, and who sought to reconcile their discrepancies. From these three documents, that attributed to Africanus, that of the Old Chronicle, and that of Eusebius were respectively derived, the process in each case being a process of deliberate falsification of the Egyptian text, grounded on non-Egyptian documents, with a view to establish synchronisms between dates given by A, B, and C, and dates supposed to be given by the non-Egyptian documents. The processes by which the lists of the supposed Africanus, the compiler of the Old Chronicle, and Eusebius, were obtained from the original list of Manetho, have to be reversed in our present proceeding. That is, we have, first, by a criticism in which non-Egyptian documents play a principal part, to recover the documents A, B, and C; and we have, secondly, by a criticism grounded on these three documents alone, to obtain the original text of which they were corruptions.

14. I begin with the first criticism, the object of which is from the three existing lists to recover the three lists A, B, and C; and I begin by remarking that in order that the result of the criticism may be satisfactory, the criticism must proceed on fixed and sound principles. In the first place, we have nothing to do with the question, What is the truth? Chronological truth is, I feel confident, contained in the original list of Manetho, but it is certainly not contained in any of the lists, A, B, and C. Nay, it is very possible that these may deviate from it

even more than the existing lists. Our present object is to distinguish non-Egyptian corruptions from what is Egyptian; whether the latter be the truth of Manetho, or the blunders of his followers. To distinguish what is Egyptian from what is non-Egyptian, I lay down the following canons:—

I. If a number occurs in two of the existing lists, it is Egyptian; the number in the third list may, or may not, be Egyptian. The three existing lists are independent of one another, having been corrupted by persons who sought to establish by their corruptions different synchronisms. It is, therefore, not to be supposed that two of them should have obtained the same numbers by their corruptions.

II. If a marginal note be appended to one of the lists, say A, which is inconsistent with that list, the marginal note is Egyptian, and probably Manetho's own, and the inconsistency arises from one or more non-Egyptian corruptions.

III. Where any of the lists contains or implies a synchronism with a non-Egyptian date, this synchronism has been produced by a corruption; the interval between the Egyptian date in the original list and the date which the compiler of the existing list believed to be the proper one having been added to, or subtracted from, some one of the Egyptian numbers, or having been divided into parts, which were added to, or subtracted from, some two or more of the Egyptian numbers.

It will be seen that each of the three existing lists contains a synchronism, produced by corruption, and that the three synchronisms are all different.

IV. Where a number that has to be added or subtracted in order to produce a synchronism is divided, it may be assumed that the division is so made as that all the changes but one are of the easiest and most obvious kind; that is to say, additions or subtractions of multiples of ten, or omissions of the units in a number, so as to reduce it to a multiple of ten.

V. Where a number is taken away from the duration of one dynasty and added to that of another, in order to correct a supposed non-Egyptian anachronism, the number so dealt with is probably a round number, that is, a multiple of ten.

I lay down these canons in order that it may be seen that my mode of proceeding is not an arbitrary one, and that the result at which I arrive is the only one that can be legitimately attained.

15. I will now consider what the synchronisms were which guided the persons who introduced into the lists non-Egyptian corruptions. Two of these are derived from the exodus of the Israelites; and it is therefore necessary to consider at what date

the early Christians placed this. St. Clement of Alexandria says expressly that the exodus took place 345 years before the renewal of the canicular cycle, which we know was in 1322 B.C. The date intended is therefore 1667 B.C.; a date which appears to have been that of all the early Christians, with the exception of Julius Africanus, who threw the exodus back 130 years. In the dynastic lists attributed to Africanus we find the accession of the eighteenth dynasty placed in 1667 B.C., a marginal note being added stating that this was also the date of the departure of the Israelites under Moses. From this Bunsen inferred that, when Clement placed the exodus in 1667 B.C., he meant that this was the date of the accession of the eighteenth dynasty, with which he erroneously supposed that the exodus synchronized. I have not a copy of the *Stromates* within reach, but I believe that there is no proof that he believed the exodus to synchronize with the accession of the eighteenth dynasty. This, however, is immaterial; others certainly thought so. But what appears to me quite certain is that 1667 B.C. is given by him as the date of the exodus itself, and that it was obtained from the Bible, without any reference to Egyptian chronology. Instead of its being borrowed from Manetho, as Bunsen imagined, the list which bears the name of Africanus has suffered corruption, in order that it might be brought into harmony with the Biblical date of the exodus, which was assumed to be that of the accession of the eighteenth dynasty.

16. In order that it may be clearly seen that this date of 1667 B.C. is a Biblical one, and that the authority on which it rests may be made manifest, I will give the chronology of the two books of Kings, according to the early Christians, and according to the margin of the English Bible, in parallel columns; the difference between the two dates being given in a third column; and whenever this difference changes, I will explain the grounds of the change.

The Exodus	1667	B.C.	1491	B.C.	176
Building of the Temple....	1027	"	1012	"	15 (a)
Accession of Rehoboam....	990	"	975	"	15
" Abijam	973	"	958	"	15
" Asa	970	"	955	"	15
" Jehoshaphat..	929	"	914	"	15
" Jehoram	904	"	892	"	12 (b)
" Ahaziah	896	"	885	"	11 (c)
" Athaliah	895	"	884	"	11
" Jehoash	889	"	878	"	11
" Amaziah	849	"	839	"	10 (d)
" Uzziah	820	"	810	"	10
" Jotham	768	"	758	"	10
" Ahaz	752	"	742	"	10
" Hezekiah	736	"	726	"	10

Accession of Manasseh	707 B.C.	698 B.C.	9 (<i>d</i>)
" Amon	652 "	643 "	9
" Josiah	650 "	641 "	9
" Jehoiakim	619 "	610 "	9
" Zedekiah	608 "	599 "	9 (<i>e</i>)

17 (*a*). The difference between the two dates is here diminished by 161 years, of which the main part 160 is due to the circumstance that in 1 Kings vi. 1 the early Christians read in their Bibles "six hundred and fortieth," where our Bibles, following the present Hebrew text, read "four hundred and eightieth." In the text of the LXX., as now received, we have "four hundred and fortieth,"—a corrupt reading made out of the true reading of the LXX. and the translation of the Hebrew text which Origen made for his *Hexapla*. The additional year of difference arose from the early Christians having counted 640 complete years, whereas the English Bible counts 480 current years, or 479 complete years.

18 (*b*). It is distinctly stated in 1 Kings xxii. 42, that Jehoshaphat reigned twenty-five years. In the margin of the English Bible this is reduced to twenty-two, on the strength of certain synchronisms between the reigns of the kings of Judah and Israel, which, according to the present Hebrew text, are inconsistent with his having reigned twenty-five years. The passages which give these synchronisms were translated into Greek by Origen for his *Hexapla*, and from that, as in many other instances, they have found their way into our present copies of the LXX. The original reading of the LXX. is, however, given also in these copies, and it fully supports the larger number of years assigned to Jehoshaphat in the passage already cited. After 1 Kings xvi. 28, the LXX., as uncorrupted, proceeds: "And in the eleventh year of Omri Jehoshaphat the son of Asa began to reign." Then follows the passage which in our present Bibles stands as 1 Kings xxii. 42—50, substituting, however, in verse 49 "the king of Israel" for "Ahaziah, the son of Ahab." After relating the succession of Jehoram, the LXX. proceeds as in 1 Kings xvii. 29, etc.; but in the beginning of verse 29 it reads, "And in the second year of Jehoshaphat king of Judah began Ahab," etc.

19 (*c*). It is stated in both the Hebrew text and the LXX. that Jehoram reigned eight years. In the margin of the English Bible, however, only seven are assigned to him. The suppression of a year is, no doubt, due to the synchronisms which, as they now stand in the Hebrew, cannot be reconciled with one another without great difficulty, and without arbitrary assumptions of kings reigning in consort, and reigns being counted from different

epochs. I observe that the latter part of 2 Kings i. 17 is omitted in the LXX. It appears to be spurious. The Hebrew text in 2 Kings viii. 16 does not admit the translation given in the English Bible, which however is scarcely capable of a consistent interpretation. The only admissible translation would be, "And in the fifth year of Joram, the son of Ahab, king of Israel, and of Jehoshaphat king of Judah;" which is manifestly self-contradictory. Our present copies of the LXX. furnish us with no help. They contain a version of the Hebrew text, probably that of Origen taken from the *Hexapla*. The genuine reading of the LXX. is not given *also*, as it is in the First Book of Kings. Under these circumstances the only safe course is to have regard to the lengths of the reigns which are given, neglecting the corrupted synchronisms; and here we meet with no difficulty, for the two sets of numbers correspond. In the Biblical chronology of the kings of Judah, I take it that we have a chronological canon of the same nature as that of Ptolemy; as many years being assigned to each king as there were new moons of Nisan in his reign. On the contrary, a reign of a king of Israel was reckoned to include all the years in any part of which he was king. His first year was the civil—or, as some call it, the ecclesiastical year (beginning with the new moon of Nisan)—in which he came to the throne; while the accession of a king of Judah might be described, in reference to the reign of a king of Israel, either as the year corresponding to his first year, or as the year next before this. The following table will shew how the two sets of numbers of years assigned to the kings of Judah and Israel correspond. I prefix years B.C. at the new moon next after the vernal equinox of which the regnal years of the kings of Judah commenced. For the present these years B.C. may be regarded as arbitrary, and only approximate; but I will shew in the course of this paper that they are the true years, as fixed by astronomical observations. I begin with the accession of Omri in the thirty-first year of Asa, after the termination of the civil war. See 1 Kings xvi. 23.

B.C. 929	Thirty-first Asa	First Omri
" 919	Forty-first Asa	Eleventh Omri
" 918	First Jehoshaphat	Twelfth Omri and first Ahab
" 917	Second Jehoshaphat	Second Ahab
" 897	Twenty-second Jehoshaphat	Twenty-second Ahab and first Ahaziah
" 896	Twenty-third Jehoshaphat	Second Ahaziah and first Joram
" 894	Twenty-fifth Jehoshaphat	Third Joram
" 893	First Jehoram	Fourth Joram
" 886	Eighth Jehoram	Eleventh Joram
" 885	First Ahaziah	Twelfth Joram

20 (*d*). The reigns of Jehoash and Hezekiah are expressly

stated to have lasted forty and twenty-nine years respectively ; but in the margin of the English Bible a year is struck off from each of them.

(e). The early Christian placed the accession of Zedekiah and the captivity of Jeconiah, which was in the same year, seventy years before the capture of Babylon by Cyrus, which all agree to have been in 538 B.C. They assumed this to be the true interval, believing that the prophecy of the seventy weeks' captivity referred to these limits. Archbishop Ussher transferred the earlier limit from the captivity of Jeconiah to an earlier captivity in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar. He assumed that this was 606 B.C., and that the year of Necho's expedition, in which Josiah was killed, was 610 B.C. In reality, however, this last event took place in 608 B.C.; the earliest date of which Egyptian chronology admits, as I will shew when I come to consider the separate reigns ; and the canon of Ptolemy fixes the accession of Nebuchadnezzar in 604 B.C. Archbishop Ussher thought that the canon gave the date of his father's death, and that he reigned two years in conjunction with him previous to 604 B.C. This, however, is an inadmissible hypothesis. Nebuchadnezzar's years must have been counted from the year when he became king. They were certainly counted from 604 B.C. and therefore he became king then. If he became king two years before his father's death, his father must have lived till 602 B.C. I believe that his father was the Labynetus of Herodotus, and that he was the king who intervened at the termination of the Lydian war in 603 B.C. The death of Josiah, and capture of Jerusalem by Necho, in 608 B.C., and the first captivity, at the beginning of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar in 604 B.C., appear to me to be fully-established chronological facts, as to which no rational controversy can exist. We may date the seventy years' captivity from the former, and make it to terminate at the capture of Babylon ; or we may date it from the latter, and make it to terminate at the death of Darius the Mede, placing this last in 534 B.C. I am not aware of there being any authority for preferring the received date of 536 B.C. to this. The question of the seventy years' captivity belongs to the department of theology rather than to that of chronology ; and its discussion does not lie within the compass of the present paper.

21. I have now shewn that the date of 1667, assigned to the exodus by St. Clement of Alexandria, and believed to be the true date by the early Christians generally, was a purely Biblical date, obtained by calculation from Biblical numbers, historical or prophetical. It appears to have been accepted by all the

early Christians, with the exception of Julius Africanus, who threw the exodus back 130 years. He is blamed for having done this by Georgius Syncellus, who frequently complains of his chronological blunders. It appears that while he adhered to the apostolical tradition, that the incarnation of Christ was exactly 5500 years after the creation, he omitted the generation of the second or post-diluvian Cainan, which is given in the LXX. as 130 years, and that he compensated for this omission by adding 110 years to the interval between the exodus and the foundation of the temple, and twenty more to the interval between that and the first year of Darius. The Syncellus is not very clear in his statements as to where this error was committed. It seems clear, however, that he placed the captivity of Jeconiah in 631 B.C., seventy years before the accession of Cyrus to the throne of Persia. Here then he added twenty-three years to the received chronology. *Somewhere*, therefore, between the building of the temple and the captivity of Jeconiah he must have dropped three years. It is a matter of no importance, however, where this loss was, or how it was occasioned.

22. Having now shewn what was the date of the exodus according to the early Christians generally, and what it was according to the peculiar views of Julius Africanus, I proceed to speak of the synchronisms believed to exist between the exodus and events in Egyptian history. Two opinions seem to have divided the early Christians, each of which has been brought to bear on one of the existing lists. Africanus imagined, as Josephus had done before him, and probably other Jews, who thought that it was creditable to their nation, that the Hyk-shôs were the Israelites, that their expulsion was an Egyptian mode of describing the exodus, and that, consequently, the accession of the eighteenth dynasty, which synchronized with the expulsion of the Hyk-shôs, ought to be referred to the Biblical date of the exodus. The other opinion, which was probably held by a much greater number of the early Christians, and which was subsequently adopted by the Syncellus, harmonized much better with the Biblical narrative. According to it, the exodus did not take place at the commencement of the eighteenth dynasty, but eighty years or upwards after it. The Israelites came into Egypt in the time of the shepherds. One of these was the Pharaoh that advanced Joseph; Ahmô's of the eighteenth dynasty, who expelled them, was the new king who knew not Joseph, and who commanded that the Hebrew infants should not be suffered to live. Aaron was born before this edict, and of course before Ahmô's came to the throne; and Moses, it is supposed, was born very shortly after his accession. The

exodus, it is said, took place when Moses was eighty years old. All, therefore, that was necessary in order to determine the exact interval was, as was supposed, to find the least interval, consisting of a complete number of reigns, extending from Ahmô's downwards, and exceeding eighty years. Now Josephus gives the reigns from Ahmô's down with very great apparent accuracy, not only the years but the months being stated; and it cannot reasonably be doubted that the list which Josephus gives was Egyptian, if not Manetho's own. According to this list, the first four reigns consisted of $25y. 4m. + 13y. + 20y. 7m. + 21y. 9m. = 80y. 8m.$, or 81 years. Hence, the early Christians placed the accession of the eighteenth dynasty eighty-one years before the Biblical date of the exodus, or in 1748 B.C.

23. Plausible as this hypothesis is in some respects, there is probably no Egyptologist of the present day that could accept it. To say nothing of the monumental evidence connected with the early kings of the eighteenth dynasty (which, however, present very great difficulties), there are two parts of this hypothetic scheme which are plainly repugnant to the Biblical narrative. In the time of Joseph every shepherd was an abomination to the Egyptians: this could not have been the case when the Hyk-shô's kings were on the throne. And again, the fourth reign of those which make up the eighty-one years is that of a queen, whereas the Biblical narrative states expressly that the exodus was at the end of the reign of a king. The Biblical narrative would obviously be better satisfied by supposing the persecutors of the Israelites to be of the Hyk-shô's dynasty, and the patron of Joseph to be of the Egyptian dynasty which preceded them; when the Shô'su, or shepherds, were known as troublesome neighbours, but were not yet known as conquerors and oppressors of Egypt. Neither of the two modes of making the exodus to synchronize with events in Egyptian history which were current among the early Christians was a proper mode. It is fortunate, however, that both were in use, and that the existing lists were falsified, one of them in order to produce one synchronism, and another to produce the other; as this circumstance is a great assistance in restoring the genuine reading.

24. But, whatever be the defects of the two hypothetic schemes which I have mentioned, I cannot help saying that either of them is, in my judgment, far less objectionable than the modern scheme which has been devised as a mode of reconciling them. The inventor of it,—I will not mention his name, because I am not sure of it, and I have not the works within reach which would enable me to ascertain it, and also because I suspect it to be one to whom Egyptology is under very great

obligations,—the inventor of it, whoever he was, set out with supposing that, instead of the two hypotheses starting from the one date of the exodus, 1667 B.C., and placing the accession of Ahmô's, one of them in that year, and the other eighty-one years before it, they started from the accession of Ahmô's, and supposed two—not exoduses, but—expulsions of the Hyk-shô's, one of them at that time, and the other, eighty-one years after, at the beginning of the fifth reign in the dynasty. Ahmô's, according to this hypothesis, drove the Hyk-shô's out of the rest of Egypt, and shut them up in Avaris, and Thothmô's, the fifth king of the dynasty, drove them out of Avaris. One writer after another has repeated this statement, as if it were an unquestionable truth, although the only ancient authority adduced in support of it was manifestly misunderstood. To me, who never accepted this hypothesis, and to whom it was always a puzzle how any one else could believe it, the pertinacity with which it has been adhered to appears most unaccountable. Bunsen in his latest work, the fourth volume of his *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, and Lepsius in his *Königsbuch*, treat the existence of this interval between the partial and the complete expulsion of the shepherds as a settled point. Lepsius makes a seventeenth dynasty of it, to which he assigns ninety-three years. Now this appears to me absolutely inconsistent with the well-established fact that Thothmô's I., the third king of this dynasty, carried his arms into Mesopotamia. I cannot conceive it possible that he could have done this, if there were within the frontiers of Egypt, in the direction to which he had to march, a large fortified city in the hands of his enemies. And more than this, as De Rougé has long since pointed out, Ahmô's, the son of Abna, is made to say on his funeral stèle that in the sixth year of king Ahmô's he took part in the capture of Avaris; after which he says that the king passed along the Nile, the whole length of Egypt from the north to the south (*Stèle Egyptienne*, p. 119). The idea of the shepherds having remained in Egypt till the reign of Thothmô's III. is, in one word, a pure fiction of modern Egyptologists, for which there is no foundation either in the writings of the extractors from Manetho, or in the hieroglyphic records.

25. Having thus cleared the way, I will proceed to consider the three lists as handed down to us by Georgius Syncellus, confining myself to the portions which begin with the eighteenth dynasty and end with the twenty-sixth. I here give the duration of each dynasty according to the three authorities, and the interval from the accession of Ahmô's to the beginning of each dynasty after the eighteenth.

	Africanus.		Old Chronicle.		Eusebius.	
Eighteenth dynasty	263	263	348	348	348	348
Nineteenth "	209	472	194	542	194	542
Twentieth "	135	607	228	770	178	720
Twenty-first "	130	737	121	891	130	850
Twenty-second "	120	857	48	939	49	899
Twenty-third "	89	946	19	958	44	943
Twenty-fourth "	6	952	44	1002	44	987
Twenty-fifth "	40	992	44	1046	44	1031
Twenty-sixth "	150	1142	177	1223	167	1198

It will be observed that the interval between the expulsion of the Hyk-shôs and the conquest of Egypt is exactly eighty-one years more according to the Old Chronicle than according to Africanus, the latter going back to the exodus, and the Old Chronicle to a period eighty-one years before it. Take 1142 for 1667 B.C., or 1223 from 1748 B.C., and there remains 525 B.C. for the date of the conquest of Egypt.

26. Before going further, it is necessary to consider the summation at the end of the twenty-fourth dynasty which is given by the Syncellus in the list which he ascribes to Africanus. No one, I believe, pointed out the meaning of this number until I did so in my paper of 1861, already cited. I observed that if we substituted 44 for 6 as the duration of the twenty-fourth dynasty, which number 44 is found both in Eusebius and in the Old Chronicle, we should have 990 in place of 952 for the sum of the dynasties beginning with the eighteenth and ending with the twenty-fourth. This number left standing alone, and with nothing to explain it in the list where it stood, is therefore Egyptian, and I doubt not Manetho's own (can. ii. of § 14). It follows from this that the number 6 in Africanus's list was 44 in A; that one of the numbers in the list of the Old Chronicle is too great by twelve, and one of those in that of Eusebius is too small by three.

27. I have hitherto said nothing as to the synchronism, to effect which the list of Eusebius was corrupted from C. It did not depend on the exodus. Eusebius places this at the end of one of the reigns in the latter part of the eighteenth dynasty, and does not seem to have connected any other Egyptian event with it. He placed it honestly where, according to his Biblical views, it ought to be placed, making no alteration in Egyptian chronology with a view to establish a synchronism. If we look, however, to the end of the nineteenth dynasty, we shall see his synchronism. He says that Troy was taken in the last year of this dynasty. Take 542 from 1198, and there remains 656, the interval, according to Eusebius, between the fall of Troy and 525 B.C., the conquest of Egypt. Eusebius's date of the taking of Troy is 1181 B.C., *three* years later than that of Eratosthenes;

and it cannot be doubted that Eusebius struck off the three years mentioned in the last section, in order to reduce the received date, with which C was in harmony, to his own. Let us now consider from which dynasty he struck off these years. Certainly not from the eighteenth, nineteenth, nor twenty-fourth, in which his numbers are the same as those in the Old Chronicle; nor yet from the twenty-first, where he agrees with Africanus. There remain the twentieth, twenty-second, and twenty-third; but if we look to the twenty-second, as it stands in Africanus's list, we shall see that the forty-nine years assigned to this dynasty by Eusebius are Egyptian. Africanus divides the dynasty thus:

α'	Σεσωγχις	ἔτη	KA'
β'	Ὀσορθών	ἔτη	IE'
γ' δ' ϵ'	Ἄλλοι τρεῖς	ἔτη	KE'
ς'	Τακέλωθις	ἔτη	II'
ζ' η' θ'	Ἄλλοι τρεῖς	ἔτη	MB'

It is evident that, when the compiler of C thought it necessary to diminish the length of this dynasty, he felt himself obliged to stop at forty-nine, the sum of the three single reigns which are given; viz., 21 + 15 + 13. We may be sure, therefore, that these three numbers are Egyptian. We cannot substitute fifty-two for forty-nine in C; nor yet can we admit any such correction as *KA'* for *KA'* or *IO'* for *IE'*, which have been proposed. If a correction of any number be required to make the sum accurate, we must read *KO'* for *KE'*. But it is an unsafe assumption that changes of the text were accidental, having been occasioned by similarity of letters; in the great majority of instances they were deliberately made, with a view to improve the text which the writer knew that he had before him.

28. It appears from what has been said that the three years struck off from C by Eusebius, were struck off either from the twentieth or from the twenty-third dynasty. We must suppose either that C had 181 for the length of the twentieth, or that it had 47 for that of the twenty-third. It will occur to most persons that the latter supposition is the more probable of the two, as it alters one of the three forty-fours which appear in the list of Eusebius as the number of years in these successive dynasties. It seems, at first, very improbable that this should be the case; and yet, if Eusebius obtained the number 44 accidentally by taking three from 47, neither of which last numbers was chosen in order to produce the 44, it does not appear to me that the improbability of the concurrence of three forty-fours is such as to have much weight. It appears to me a much stronger argument in favour of making this change rather

than the other, that 228, the length of the twentieth dynasty in the Old Chronicle, is probably a corruption of 178, the length according to Eusebius; and that the corruption having been made to avoid an anachronism, a displacement of the round number fifty years is vastly more probable than one of forty-seven. At any rate, as the two arguments tend to the same conclusion, I think we may safely infer that the change was made in the twenty-third dynasty, where C had 47 for the 44 of Eusebius. It will corroborate this conclusion if we find that to read 178 in the Old Chronicle as the length of the twentieth dynasty would produce an anachronism, according to a natural mode of connecting the reign of Rehoboam with Egyptian history, and that the substitution of 228 for it would remove the anachronism. Before, however, I consider the numbers in the Old Chronicle, I have something more to say of Eusebius.

29. It is not to be supposed possible that so laborious a chronologist as he was, and who had made so many changes as we know he did in the chronology previously received, as respected both sacred and profane history, should have made no change in the list of the Egyptian dynasties, other than to substitute 44 for 47 as the length of one of them. I by no means affirm this. I say that this was the only difference between the list given by the Syncellus as that of Eusebius, and the list that I call C,—the only change made by Eusebius from a non-Egyptian source; but I believe that the list C was constructed by Eusebius himself out of the two Egyptian documents A and B, which he had before him: and it will be found very useful in settling points that might otherwise be dubious in these two lists. We may assume that there is nothing in C which is not derived from A or B; and as a first-fruit of this principle we may conclude that 167, the duration of the twenty-sixth dynasty in C, must have been that of B also; for it is impossible that it could come from A. The person who diminished the durations of the later dynasties in order to bring down the exodus to 1667 B.C., and who struck off 38 years from the twenty-fourth, and manifestly 4 from the twenty-fifth (rejecting the units in the 44 found in the other two lists), must have rejected a unit in the twenty-sixth also. The duration must have been $150 + X$, X being less than ten, and could not therefore have produced 167.

30. The framer of the list in the Old Chronicle then added 22 years to the duration of the dynasties in B, in order to raise the accession of the eighteenth dynasty to 1748 B.C., *i.e.*, 81 years before the exodus; and he effected this by adding 10 years to the twenty-sixth, and 12 to some of those before the twenty-fourth. The duration of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth

were 44 in all the Egyptian copies, as well as in the Old Chronicle and Eusebius. Now why did he divide these 22 years and add them in two places? Evidently to throw the accession of the twenty-fourth, or Ethiopian dynasty, sufficiently far back to maintain the proper Biblical synchronism. Hezekiah began to reign, according to the early Christians, in 736 B.C. (§ 16), and the first Ethiopian king had his aid sought by Hoshea before this. Now, according to B, the twenty-sixth dynasty began, as we have just seen, 167 years before Cambyses, that is, before 525 B.C. (§ 25), or in 692 B.C. The Ethiopian dynasty began 44 years earlier, or in 736 B.C., which as we have just seen is too late. Accordingly the compiler of the chronicle added ten years to the twenty-sixth dynasty, throwing back the accession of the twenty-fourth to 746 B.C., which produces the required synchronism.

31. We see from this that the compiler of the Old Chronicle did not look to the Exodus alone, as what required a synchronism in Egyptian chronology. He made a change in order to make the period of the Ethiopian dynasty synchronize with the reigns of Hoshea and Hezekiah; and this being the case we cannot doubt but that he would make the close of the reign of Solomon and the fourth year of Rehoboam to stand in what he would consider their proper place in Egyptian chronology. We now know perfectly well that the Shishak who then reigned in Egypt was the first king of the twenty-second dynasty; but to the compiler of the Old Chronicle such a supposition could not occur. According to the Old Chronicle the twenty-second and twenty-third dynasties together only lasted 67 years, and there is a doubt whether the twelve years which the compiler of the Chronicle added were not added to one of these dynasties. On the most favourable supposition, the twenty-second dynasty, which began according to the Old Chronicle in 847 B.C., would not begin before 837 B.C. in B; and it very probably would not begin till 825 B.C. The fifth year of Rehoboam fell according to the early Christians in 986 B.C.: so that the synchronism now known to be the proper one was one that he could not conceive possible. His idea evidently was that the year 994 must fall within the twentieth dynasty, where the kings were not named, and not in the twenty-first, where all the kings were named, and where it was clear that none could be identified with Shishak. Let us suppose that the twentieth dynasty lasted according to B 178 years; the eighteenth beginning in 1726 B.C., the nineteenth in 1378 B.C., and the twentieth in 1184 B.C.; the twenty-first would begin according to B in 1006 B.C., and according to the Old Chronicle in 1028 B.C. This is 42 years before the fifth year of

Rehoboam, which, according to the notions of the compiler of the Chronicle, was the limit which the twentieth dynasty must include. Therefore, he added 50 years to the twentieth dynasty, and subtracted the same number from one of the subsequent ones.

32. It is still uncertain what were the durations of the twenty-first, twenty-second, and twenty-third dynasties, according to B; but we now know that the sum of the three was not $121 + 48 + 19 = 188$ as in the Old Chronicle, but $188 + 50 - 12 = 226$. We have

	B		C	
Eighteenth	348	348	348	348
Nineteenth	194	542	194	542
Twentieth	178	720	178	720
Twenty-first	} (121? 48? 19?)	?	130	850
Twenty-second		?	49	899
Twenty-third		946	47	946
Twenty-fourth	44	990	44	990
Twenty-fifth	44	1034	44	1034
Twenty-sixth	167	1201	167	1201

The lists B and C only differ in the duration which they assign to the twenty-first, twenty-second, and twenty-third dynasties; and it is evident that as to these they do differ materially. No addition of 50 years to a dynasty of the Old Chronicle and subtraction of twelve from the same or another can bring them into harmony. Here then the list C must have been taken from A; and I will now proceed to recover as far as possible this last list, which may again, when recovered, assist us in recovering the deficient numbers in B.

33. The list given in § 25 as that of Africanus cannot be really his; for the list, as given by the Syncellus, contains a statement that the exodus took place at the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty; and we know that Africanus placed the exodus 130 years earlier than the accession of the eighteenth dynasty is here placed. When we recollect, however, that Josephus, who agrees with Africanus in respect to the synchronism of the exodus, says expressly and repeatedly that the eighteenth dynasty lasted 393 years, I think we cannot reasonably doubt that 263 was substituted for 393, which Africanus had in his list, by some corrector of Africanus, who disapproved of his lengthened chronology. It is certain, however, that the early Christians placed the exodus in 1667 B.C., and that this was, consequently, the date of the accession of the eighteenth dynasty, after they had cut down the three last dynasties from $44 + 44 + 150 + X$ to $6 + 40 + 150$. Somewhere, therefore, after the eighteenth dynasty Africanus must have added 130 years; and let us now consider where.

34. In the first place, there can be no doubt that the duration of the nineteenth dynasty, which is divided into the several reigns, has been enormously magnified by Africanus. He makes the reigns of four kings, in four successive generations from father to son, to reign 191, or rather, if we correct a clerical error, 196 years, which is out of all bounds of probability. Here then Africanus has added something considerable. Sixty years, which would leave 136 years for the four reigns, cannot be thought too much to take from the 209, which he joins to the dynasty; and that this was the true number that he added is rendered almost certain from the comparison of $393 + 149$ with $348 + 194$. Each sum is 542. It is very possible that the eighteenth dynasty was divided by Manetho into two portions, the latter of which lasted 45 years; and that while some of Manetho's followers, including the author of A, connected this period with the eighteenth dynasty, others, as the author of B, connected it with the nineteenth. We shall see hereafter that there is direct evidence that such a division of the eighteenth dynasty was made, and that the latter portion of it lasted 45 years.

35. There remain seventy years, which Africanus must have added to some dynasty between the nineteenth and the twenty-fourth. This could not be the twenty-first, because Eusebius, whose authorities were A and B, agrees with Africanus as to the duration of this being 130 years. It must, therefore, be either the twentieth, the twenty-second, or the twenty-third. In favour of the first supposition there are two probabilities. Africanus would be likely to make his additions to two adjacent dynasties; and the addition was more likely to have been made in the twentieth dynasty, where the reigns are not divided, than in either of the others, where the reigns are divided, and are already below the average, and in one of the dynasties greatly below it. It may occur to a person that by taking 70 years from 89, the length of the twenty-third dynasty in Africanus, we get 19, its length according to the Old Chronicle; but this number 19 is a very doubtful one, being one of three among which there exists two errors (§ 32). And the division of Africanus's duration of the entire dynasty 89 into the four separate reigns $40 + 8 + 10 + 31$ (44 for 44) seems to me to have strong internal evidence of its genuineness. But what seems to me to settle the question is this. Suppose that 65 was the reading of the early Christians and of A in this place, it accounts for the numbers in C. Eusebius in compiling this list had before him A and B. The four dynasties as to which there is now a doubt would, on the last supposition, stand thus in A, B, and C; all of which agree as to their entire duration being 404.

	A	B	C
Twentieth	65	178	178
Twenty-first	130	226	130
Twenty-second	120		49
Twenty-third	89		47

Eusebius seems to have preferred B's duration of the twentieth dynasty, and to have taken A's durations as the more likely to be correct for the three following ones. He retained A's number for the twenty-first dynasty, and he had then to subtract from the two following the 113 which he had added to A's duration of the twentieth. He took from the twenty-second so many as reduced the entire duration according to A to 49, the number in the three reigns expressed separately (see § 27); that is, he took 71 from this dynasty, and the remaining 42 he took from the twenty-third, reducing its duration from 89 to 47.

36. I now proceed to compare the lists A and B. Both of these are imperfect; the duration of the twenty-sixth dynasty being wanting in the former, so far as respects the units, by which it exceeded 150, and the durations of the twenty-first, twenty-second, and twenty-third being uncertain in the latter. We only know that they were the three numbers, 121, 48, and 19, one of them increased by 50, and one of them diminished by 12, the third being unaltered; or possibly, though not probably, one of them being increased by 38, and the other two unaltered. I will now assume what cannot be considered absolutely certain, but what has a great deal of plausibility about it. It is not the only hypothesis that is admissible; but I find that it gives the duration of the eighteenth dynasty according to Manetho, when all corruptions have been weeded away, such as can be divided into separate reigns in a more satisfactory manner than the other hypothesis does. It will be observed that, according to B, the accession of the twentieth dynasty synchronizes with the fall of Troy, according to Eratosthenes. According to A, it was at least eight years later; for 159 is the greatest length that we can assign to the twenty-sixth dynasty. I assume that it was nine years later; that the number 121 is according to B the duration of the twenty-first dynasty, and that it was increased in A to 130, with a view to throw back the accession of the twentieth dynasty to 1184 B.C. The two lists A and B would then stand as follows, as proved, and on the hypothesis just assumed.

	A (as proved)		(as assumed)	B (as proved) (as assumed)			
Eighteenth	393	393		348	348	348	348
Nineteenth	149	542		194	542	194	542
Twentieth	65	607		178	720	178	720

	A (as proved)		(as assumed)	B (as proved)		(as assumed)
Twenty-first	130	737	}	226	946	121 841
Twenty-second	120	857				105 946
Twenty-third	89	946				
Twenty-fourth	44	990		44	990	44 990
Twenty-fifth	44	1034		44	1034	44 1034
Twenty-sixth	150 + X	1184 + X	158 1192	167	1201	167 1201

37. Now, assuming what I have here assumed, it is easy to trace back these lists to two earlier lists, which may be called D and E. The latter will be obtained by merely reducing the duration of the twenty-sixth dynasty from 167 to 158. The former will be obtained by substituting 74 + 121 for 65 + 130, as the duration of the twentieth and twenty-first combined. A corruptor first added nine years to the 121, in order to bring the accession of the twentieth dynasty to 1184 B.C.; and then, observing that the sum of the seven dynasties had become 999 in place of 990, some other corruptor struck the nine years in excess from the twentieth dynasty. We have thus

	D			E		
Eighteenth	393	393	1717	348	348	1717
Nineteenth	149	542	1324	194	542	1349
Twentieth	74	616	1175	178	720	1175
Twenty-first	121	737	1101	121	841	997
Twenty-second	120	857	980	48?	?	876
Twenty-third	89	946	860	19?	946	?
Twenty-fourth	44	990	771	44	990	771
Twenty-fifth	44	1034	727	44	1034	727
Twenty-sixth	158	1192	683	158	1192	683

I add a third column under each letter giving the year B.C. when the dynasty began.

38. There is still a material difference between the two lists; but it will be possible to produce an earlier list F from which both these lists were derived, and a still earlier one, Manetho's own, of which this is a corruption. The lists D and E differ, it will be perceived, only as to three dynasties, the twentieth, twenty-second, and twenty-third; and the differences are of such a nature as can only be explained by supposing that two of these dynasties overlapped the following ones, so as to have two durations;—that each list gives the longer duration of one of the dynasties, that is, the time from its commencement to its extinction, and the shorter duration of the other, that is, the time from its commencement to the commencement of the following one;—and that the third of the dynasties, manifestly the twenty-second, was shortened by the difference between the longer and the shorter duration of that dynasty of which the full length was given. To give the correct chronology the shorter duration ought to have been given in both instances, and it is

so in F; but the framers of D and E each gave one dynasty its full length, and to maintain the total 990, they had to shorten the twenty-second dynasty.

The two durations of the twentieth dynasty are both given, 74 and 178; where, therefore, 178 is allowed for the twentieth, as in E, the twenty-second is diminished by 104. Let the shorter duration of the twenty-third be called Y, the longer is 89; and in D, where we have 89, the twenty-second dynasty is shortened by $82 - Y$; its length is $209 - Y$. Of course its length in E is $105 - Y$; and the list F must have been as follows:—

Eighteenth	348	348	1717
Additional	45	393	1369
Nineteenth	149	542	1324
Twentieth	74 + 104	616	1175
Twenty-first	121	737	1101
Twenty-second ..	$209 - Y$	$946 - Y$	980
Twenty-third . . .	$Y + (89 - Y)$	946	$771 + Y$
Twenty-fourth ..	44	990	771
Twenty-fifth . . .	44	1034	727
Twenty-sixth . . .	158	1192	683

39. The second column in this table gives the interval from Ahmô's to the accession of the following dynasty, according to the view of the composer of the list F; but if we wished to have the sum of the durations of all the dynasties, we must add to the total in this list $104 + 89 - Y = 193 - Y$; and the mistake of the composer of this list F, which affected all the other lists that we have been considering, was that he supposed 990 to be the interval between the accession of the eighteenth and the twenty-third dynasty, when it was really the sum of the duration of the seven dynasties. Manetho's duration of the eighteenth dynasty was $193 - Y$ years less than 348 or $155 + Y$. His durations of all the subsequent ones were the same. In order then to have the list as originally constructed by Manetho, we have only to determine Y the length of the twenty-third dynasty in E. The twenty-second and twenty-third dynasties are in the Old Chronicle made to have lasted 48 and 19 years; and we have seen that 50 years were deducted and 12 years added, so that the sum of the two was 105. It is far more likely that the two changes mentioned were made in different dynasties, than that a single deduction of 38 was made from one of them. In this more probable case, Y would be 69 or 7; on the less probable supposition it might be 19 or 57, but no other value is admissible. Now, the twenty-third dynasty began by the table $771 + Y$ B.C., and it lasted 89 years, or to $682 + Y$ B.C. The last king of the dynasty was, according to Manetho, Zet, who is evidently the Sethos of Herodotus, who reigned at and after the time of Sennacherib's disastrous invasion. Now, it is quite certain from

the Assyrian inscriptions that Sennacherib's first or successful invasion was in 701 B.C., which would be the first year of the successor of Zet, if Y were 19. As Zet reigned beyond a later invasion, this is impossible; and consequently no other value of Y is admissible than 7. This gives for the accession of the dynasty 778 B.C., and accords with the statement of Manetho, following the name of the first king, ἐφ'οὗ ὀλυμπιάς ἤχθη πρώτη. This remark, though it would have been true if the dynasty had commenced in 790 B.C., would not have been likely to be made. Its appositeness arises from the accession of Petubastes being almost immediately followed by the celebration of the first Olympiad. If Y were 69, or were 57, it is manifest that the remark would not be true at all.

40. We are now in a position to see the object of the division of the eighteenth dynasty. Manetho stated that it lasted 162 years to the death of Amenophis, and 45 years afterwards. Lepsius and others admit that the duration of the eighteenth dynasty after the death of Amenophis was 45 years; and there was good reason for distinguishing this unhappy period of civil war, inflamed by religious fanaticism, during which the foreign conquests of Egypt were lost, from the prosperous and glorious period which preceded this event. It is remarkable too, that the lists of Josephus and Eusebius, which were composed after 186 years had been added to the duration of this dynasty, carried it down to a king whom they called Amenophis, namely, Menephthah, the son of Ramuss II. They made the period, which according to Manetho's genuine list extended to the death of Amenhotep III., extend to the death of Menephthah.

41. The original list of Manetho was therefore as follows. I give the durations, and the first and last years of each dynasty in years of the new kingdom, and in years before Christ.

		YEARS OF AHMÔS.	YEARS B.C.
Eighteenth dynasty to the death of } Amenophis	162	1—162	1531—1370
Later reigns thereof	45	163—207	1369—1325
Nineteenth dynasty	149	208—356	1324—1176
Twentieth dynasty 74 or 178	74 or 178	357—534	1175— 998
Twenty-first dynasty	121	431—551	1101— 981
Twenty-second dynasty	202	552—753	980— 779
Twenty-third dynasty..... 7 or 89	7 or 89	754—842	778— 690
Twenty-fourth dynasty	44	761—804	771— 728
Sum of the dynasties	990		
Twenty-fifth dynasty	44	805—848	727 — 684
Twenty-sixth dynasty	158	849—1006	683 — 526

In the recovery of this list, no use whatever has been made of any monumental evidence. It is obtained exclusively from the numbers transmitted to us by the Syncellus, as those which

he found in the Old Chronicle and in the works of Africanus and Eusebius. And in the mode of procedure by which this original list has been recovered, there is scarcely anything which is at all arbitrary. The only doubts that can be entertained are whether 158, rather than 157 or 159, was the duration assigned to the twenty-sixth dynasty, and whether 121 or 130 was that of the twenty-first. The effect of supposing it to be 130 might be to bring down the date of the accession of Ahmô's nine years; for in that case, in order to maintain the summation of 990, we must subtract nine years either from the twenty-second dynasty, which would bring down the date of Shishonk's accession to 971 B.C., leaving the earlier and later dates as they stand; or from the twentieth, which would require that 65 be substituted for 74 as the interval between the accessions of the twentieth and twenty-first, which change again would require that $113 + 82 = 195$ years be subtracted from 348, in place of 186, and would thus bring down the accession of the eighteenth dynasty by nine years. The monumental eclipse of the twenty-second dynasty appears to me to furnish conclusive evidence in favour of the date 980 B.C.; and the consideration of Manetho's lengths of the several reigns has led me to prefer the earlier to the later date of the accession of Ahmô's, and therefore to prefer 121 to 130. Besides, I have given a plausible reason for corrupting the former of these numbers into the latter, and I can see no reason for a change in the opposite direction.

42. Assuming then that these doubtful points, which very slightly affect the result of my criticism, have been correctly decided, I proceed to test the correctness of my restoration by monumental evidence. There are three points to be specially considered, *viz.*, the Ethiopian synchronisms with Biblical history, the monumental eclipse of the twenty-second dynasty, and the Sothic date of Thothmô's III. I will consider these in the order in which I have named them, and first:—My position respecting the portion of Manetho's list which relates to the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth dynasties is, that while it is chronologically true, it is for a period of 41 years historically false. He omitted to distinguish the government of Tirhakah as ruler of Ethiopia from his reign as king of Egypt; and he introduced into his list the names of three kings at the head of the twenty-sixth dynasty, who were not kings of Egypt in any sense.

43. To make this matter plain, I will give a detailed chronology of the period which intervened between the close of the twenty-second dynasty and the accession of Psamitik I., distinguishing by brackets those portions in which Manetho deviated from the truth:—

B.C.	DYN. XXIII.	DYN. XXIV.
778	Petubastes..... 40	
	First Olympiad.	
771	_____	Bocchoris, 44.
738	Osorkon..... 8	
730	Psamût 10	DYN. XXV.
727	_____	Sabacon, the Ethiopian, conquered Egypt
720	Zet..... 31	and burned to death Bocchoris, 12.
715	_____	Sebikos, 12.
703	_____	Tarakos came with an army out of Ethi-
		opia and slew Sebikos, [20].
690	Last year of Zet.	
		DYN. XXVI.
		[683 Stephinates..... 7
		676 Nechapsos 6
		670 Nekao..... 8]
		662 Psamitik I.

Chronologically there is no error here, because the interval between Tahraka's overthrow of the first Ethiopian dynasty and the accession of Psamitik I. is correctly given as 41 years, but *historically* there is a great error. When Tahraka overthrew Shebetok, he did not succeed him as king of Egypt, but contented himself with the crown of Ethiopia, which he assumed, restoring Zet, or Seti III., to the throne from which his ancestor had been expelled by Bocchoris, during whose reign, and the reigns of Shebek and Shebetok, they were confined to the marshes of the Delta. Probably his reason for adopting this course was that an oracle had limited the rule of the Ethiopian kings over Egypt to fifty years, and that twenty-four of these had already expired when he obtained the Ethiopian kingdom. Accordingly he allowed Seti to reign to his death, on which event he assumed the double crown of Egypt; his first year as king being fourteen years after his conquest of Shebetok, or 689 B.C. He reigned twenty-six years, completing the fifty allowed by the oracle, and then withdrew to Ethiopia. One year of dodecarchy or interregnum intervened, and then Psametik assumed the royal title; but some years probably elapsed before he was generally recognized. As respects actual sovereignty, therefore, as recognized in Memphis, the succession stood thus:—

778	B.C. Petubastes.
771	„ Bocchoris, who drove Petubastes to the marshes, and was himself taken prisoner and burned by
727	„ Shebek the Ethiopian.
715	„ Shebetok his son.
703	„ Zet restored by Tahraka, an Ethiopian chief, who slew Shebetok. He would, however, reckon his regnal years from the death of his father, calling that which was really his first his eighteenth.
689	„ Tahraka, king of Ethiopia, becomes king on the death of Zet.
663	„ Interregnum, Tahraka having retired to Ethiopia.
662	„ Psamitik I.

Here everything is consistent with the Second Book of

Kings, and with the cuneiform inscriptions. The embassy of Hoshea to So (Shebek) falls in his second year, and the invasions of Sennacherib, the first of which was in 701 B.C., find a king of Egypt, "a bruised reed," weak and unable to protect himself, and a king of Ethiopia his powerful protector. This king, the cotemporary of Sennacherib, is called by Herodotus Sethos, evidently the same name as Zet, and as Seti, a well-known name in the nineteenth dynasty.

44. Thus far I believe to be certain ; and to disprove it would be to overthrow my arrangement of the chronology. I am now going to state what I believe to be true, but what I do not consider quite so certain, and what may be disproved without affecting the truth of my arrangement. I believe that this Seti III. is the king whose titles are given in the *Königsbuch*, No. 618, from a stèle in the Louvre (C 100) where he is commemorated along with his daughter Mûtiritis (No. 620). So far as I can judge from the description given by others, the former part of the king's name is obliterated precisely in the same manner as the first element in the name of Seti I. and II. The defacement was not intended as a dishonour to the king but to the god, and was probably in every instance where it occurs the work of the Persians. Lepsius identifies this Mûtiritis with a princess of that name, who became the wife of a man named Petamon, and from whom one of the wives of Ahmôs the Saite was descended in the fourth generation. This accords well enough with his view as to the name of her father being Pankhi, and as to the time when he lived. It does not, however, agree with my view ; as it is scarcely probable that only six generations intervened between Seti III., who became king in 720 B.C., and Psamitik III., son of Ahmôs, who became king in 525 B.C. It is my belief that Lepsius confounds two princesses, of whom one was the granddaughter of the other. Mûtiritis, of the stèle in the Louvre, daughter of Seti III., I suppose to have married Kashto, who may have received the title of king in the lifetime of his father-in-law, and been the second of the "kings of Egypt" mentioned by Sennacherib as existing at the time of his invasion. Their daughter Amuniritis was the wife of Pankhi, who was an Ethiopian, perhaps the son of Tahraha ; and this couple had two daughters, Shapenap, wife of Psamitik I., and Mûtiritis, wife of Petamon, whose son and grandson were both born in the reign of, and called after, their maternal uncle by marriage. The great-granddaughter of the one sister, and the granddaughter of the grandson of the other, were both married to Ahmôs, who thus acquired a title, in their right, to the throne which he usurped.

45. Although genealogies do not furnish evidence of dates that can be depended on for accuracy, they often afford good approximations. It so happens that in connexion with the royal pedigrees of this period, there are two personages, the dates of whose births are determined within a year, or at most two years, by the evidence of their names; and from these we may, by allowing twenty-five years to a generation (see § 3), approximate to the reigns of others who are genealogically connected with them. The two persons whose births are thus known were king Apries and his half-sister, the wife of Ahmô's, whose coffin is in the British Museum. The former must have been born in the reign of his great-grandfather, Psamitik I., whose throne-name was given to him as his family name; and he could not have been born long before its close, because his grandfather made a campaign the year after his accession, which it cannot be supposed that a very old man would do. If we say 610 B.C., we cannot be above two years astray in the time of his birth. His half-sister was born, as her name indicates, during the reign of Psamitik II., which only lasted five years. Placing her birth in the middle of the reign in 591 B.C., we cannot be above two years astray. We have thus approximately the dates of the births of the Saitic kings, and of the descendants of the elder dynasty, as follows:—

K. Psamitik I.	b. c. 685	B.C. lived to c. 76.
K. Nekau	b. c. 660	„ lived to c. 67.
K. Psamitik II.	b. c. 635	„ lived to c. 47.
K. Wah-het-Phrâ..	b. c. 610	„ dethroned c. 41.

Seti III.	b. c. 741	B.C. lived to c. 52.	
Mûtiritis	b. c. 716	m. K. Kashto.	
Amuniritis	b. c. 691	m. K. Pankhi.	
Shapenap.	b. c. 666	m. K. Psamitik I.	Mûtiritis m. Petamun.
Nitokrit, sen.	b. c. 641	m. K. Nekau	Wah-het-Phrâ.
Nitokrit, jun.	b. c. 616	m. K. Psamitik II.	Psamitik.
Ankh-nes-nofer-het-Phrâ..	b. c. 591	m. K. Ahmô's	Petenit.
	b. c. 566		Tentkheta m. K. Ahmô's.
			K. Psamitik III.

The birth of Psamitik was, probably, considerably less than twenty-five years after 566 B.C. We may be sure that Ahmô's would marry his mother as soon as she had attained a sufficient age; and Psamitik had children when Egypt was conquered in 525 B.C. (Herod., iii., 14), who must have been five or six years old at least. We can readily suppose that the descendants of Mûtiritis were some years older than those of Shapenap, on the same line with them.

The above pedigrees are fully established from Kashto downwards. The point in which I differ from Lepsius, De Rougé,

and others, is, that they consider the king with the partly defaced name, mentioned with his daughter on the Louvre stèle, c. 110, to be Pankhi, the son-in-law of Kashto, while I consider him to be Seti III., his father-in-law.

46. The genealogy and chronology, as I have given them, are evidently in perfect harmony; and this harmony will continue if we trace back the twenty-third dynasty; Psammus being born c. 766 B.C., Osorkon, c. 791, and Petubastes, c. 816. This last would thus be about twenty-eight years of age when he came to the throne, and would have lived till he was seventy-eight. I see no reason to doubt that he was the son of Shishonk IV., the last king of the twenty-second dynasty. Here, and in several other instances, I conceive that Manetho made a new dynasty, when there was a change of the dimensions of the kingdom, though there was no change in the reigning family. Petubastes was driven out of the capitals and the principal part of Egypt by Bocchoris, and could not, therefore, be regarded as continuing the prosperous twenty-second dynasty, which held the whole kingdom. Perhaps he had the misfortune to be blind, and that this fact contributed to the success of the usurpation. At any rate, I think there can be little doubt that his retreat to the marshes of the Delta, and the subsequent restoration of his great-grandson on the overthrow of Shebetok, were the facts which, distorted and embellished by the informants of Herodotus, were the basis of his fabulous history of Anysis (ii., 137, 140). Herodotus represents Anysis himself as restored, and Sethos as his successor; but in reality, his Sethos was the restored prince, and was the third in descent from the exiled one.

47. I will now proceed to consider the eclipse which is recorded in an inscription of a king Takelut, of the twenty-second dynasty, to have taken place on the 24th Mesore, in the fifteenth year of his father. This eclipse seems to have been first noticed by Brugsch. I am not aware that any Egyptologist has disputed his interpretation of the passage, but its importance as settling the chronology of the period has not been generally recognized. This record of an eclipse has been ignored or pooh-poohed by almost all who have had occasion to notice it; and for this I can assign no other reason than that its having happened according to the inscription is inconsistent with all the chronological systems that are current among Egyptologists. The following propositions are indisputable:—

1. On the 24th Mesore of the Egyptian civil year which began 17th April, 916 B.C., that is, on the 4th April, 945 B.C., the moon was totally eclipsed.

2. On no other 24th Mesore than this, could the recorded eclipse have taken place.

3. Takelut I. was son of Osorkon I., who was son of Shishonk I., the founder of the dynasty, who, according to Africanus and Eusebius, reigned twenty-one years.

From the first and second of these propositions, it follows that, if the record be *true*, the eclipse must have been that of the 4th April, 945 B.C. No other eclipse can be put forward, except on the hypothesis, that the sculptor of the inscription was careless, and wrote the 24th Mesore by mistake for some other date.

48. This hypothesis has been put forward by Mr. Basil H. Cooper, in the *Athenæum*; he would read the 28th Mesore, on which day in the year which began 24th March, 852 B.C., namely, on the 16th March, 851 B.C., there was an eclipse of the moon visible in Egypt. Mr. Cooper felt himself constrained to make this correction of the Egyptian text, through his dependence on Lepsius's arrangement of the kings in the twenty-second dynasty, according to which the Takelut who recorded this eclipse was Takelut II. Of the correctness of that arrangement, however, Lepsius offers no positive proof. Mr. Cooper ought to have recollected his own arguments against the *correction*—rather the *corruption*—of the date of the rising of Sothis, in the inscription of Thothmô's III. at Elephantine, which Lepsius and Bunsen had advocated. It is to me utterly inconceivable, that in the record of any event of which the date is given, the writer of the inscription should put down the date incorrectly. The case of the error committed by the sculptor of the Rosetta stone in respect to the month in which the king came to the throne, is by no means a parallel case. The Rosetta stone was one of many hundred copies of a decree which would only be in force during the life of the king, in whose honour it was made. The general fate of these copies would be, that after the king's death they would be thrown aside as useless, if they could not have the inscriptions cut away so that they might receive new ones. The natural consequence of this would be, that the execution of these stèles would be committed to inferior workmen, and that those employed would be careless as to mistakes. If one of them saw that he had put down a wrong word, he would not take the trouble to correct it. On the other hand, the Karnak inscription which we are now considering was the single record of what it commemorated; the account of what had occurred was inscribed on the walls of the temple *in perpetuum rei memoriam*; and if there had been a mistake in the date, it would have been immediately observed and corrected. I

should observe also that the mistaken date on the Rosetta stone is not in the decree itself, but in a recital, and that it relates to a point in the recital which is absolutely *immaterial*; whereas, when a date is given in a historical inscription, it is probably the most material information in it. Mr. Cooper saw clearly the absurdity of supposing that the sculptor of the inscription at Elephantine had given a false date, and he ought not to have admitted so readily as he does that there was a false date in the inscription of Takelut at Karnak.

49. Unless, therefore, there can be positive proof produced that the eclipse of the 4th April, 945, *could not possibly* have been the eclipse of the inscription, I contend that we are bound in common honesty to admit that it was so; and that all presumptions to the contrary, drawn from doubtful hypotheses which are inconsistent with it, ought to fall down before this distinct record. I have already discussed this matter in § 10, to which I refer; and I now remark that there are three distinct pretended impossibilities,—in reality, inconsistencies with received theories, which are appealed to, as proving that this eclipse of 945 B.C. could not be that intended. First, it is alleged that this eclipse could not have been seen by the Egyptians. If the moon's acceleration be so great as the Astronomer Royal, Hansen, and others imagine, the moon must have been completely disengaged from the earth's shadow before she rose in Egypt. Secondly, it is alleged by Lepsius, and by Egyptologists generally after him, that the writer of this inscription was Takelut II., and not Takelut I., as I contend. If this were true, the date of 945 B.C. is, of course, inadmissible. Thirdly, it is alleged that the Biblical date of Rehoboam's accession, 975 B.C., is too early, and that Shishonk's accession, which preceded his, could not have taken place till the latter half of the tenth century before Christ. Now, the fifteenth year of Osorkon I., the father of Takelut I., must be thirty-five or thirty-six years after the accession of Shishonk; consequently, the eclipse could not have been in that regnal year of his, unless the accession of the twenty-second dynasty was in 980 B.C. or 981 B.C. My reasons for preferring the date 980 B.C. must be deferred till I come to consider the chronology of the separate reigns. Now, I deny that any one of these three alleged impossibilities is a real one. I contend that not one of the hypotheses, with which the supposition that the eclipse occurred as it is recorded that it did is inconsistent, is sufficiently established to cause us to reject a testimony like that of this inscription. I hold that the record ought to be received as it stands; and that, *consequently*, the co-efficient of the moon's acceleration must be diminished, so

as to admit of this eclipse having been seen by the Egyptians ; the Takelut of the inscription must have been the first king of that name ; and all the schemes that have been proposed for bringing down the building of the temple, or the accession of any of the kings of Judah below the dates given in the margin of the English Bible, must be rejected. The Astronomer Royal and his numerous followers, Lepsius and other Egyptologists, as well as Sir H. Rawlinson and Mr. Bosanquet, must all abandon their respective theories, which are inconsistent with a well-attested astronomical record. As to the two latter gentlemen, what I have said in § 10 will suffice ; but I have something to add in reply to the Astronomer Royal and Lepsius.

50. The supposition that the moon's acceleration has been greatly exaggerated by Hansen in his tables is by no means a new one, adopted by me in order to maintain the credit of this eclipse. I have held this opinion, and advocated it whenever I have had an opportunity, for the last six years and upwards. At the Manchester meeting of the British Association, I brought forward what appeared then, and still appears to me, to be conclusive evidence of this fact. I refer to pages 22—24 of the Report for 1861, where I refer to two lunar eclipses, recorded by Ptolemy as having taken place in 720 B.C., in both of which the eclipse is recorded to have taken place considerably after the time when it should have happened, according to Hansen's tables ; the interval between the calculated and the recorded time being, in one instance, a full hour. I stated in the paper that I did not wish the calculations to be taken on my authority ; I wished that others should make similar calculations. I am now enabled to state that such calculations have been made, and that those which I made have been found to be perfectly correct. The Astronomer Royal (whose paper read at the same meeting, entitled "Remarks on" mine, p. 12, is not a *reply* to mine, which the Astronomer Royal had not heard) referred me to a paper of Dr. Hartwig, in No. 1241 of the *Astronomische Nachrichten*, in which he gives a calculation from Hansen's tables of the different eclipses mentioned by Ptolemy. With respect to the eclipse of —719 March 8, he agrees with my calculation to a minute. He places the middle of the eclipse at 11*h.* 13*m.*, and the end at 12*h.* 7*m.* mean Babylonian time. The equation of time was then 14*m.*, which would give 10*h.* 59*m.*, and 11*h.* 53*m.* for the middle and end of the eclipse. Ptolemy's statement is, that the middle of the eclipse was ἐπ' ἄκρῳ τῷ μεσονυκτίῳ, at the very instant of midnight, at that marked period when the sixth of the two-hour clepsydras had run out, and the seventh was set a-going ; the first of the clepsydras

having been set a-going at apparent noon. This is, in its nature, an observation on the accuracy of which very great dependence can be placed. It could not have been more than a few minutes astray, and it is evident that it was recognized both by Hipparchus and by Ptolemy as the very best observation that they had. It was that which they both compared with eclipses observed in their own times, in order to determine the mean motion of the moon. And yet Dr. Hartwig, when he should produce Ptolemy's statement of what was observed, for comparison with what he had calculated, says that the middle of this eclipse was, according to Ptolemy, "unbestimmt, um mitternacht,"—*undetermined, about midnight!* I question if a more reckless misstatement of adverse testimony was ever made by the advocate of a desperate cause. In reality, the time when the eclipse was stated to have been, and must have been within a mere trifle, *greatest*, was 61*m.*, according to Dr. Hartwig's own calculation after the eclipse ought, according to the tables, to have been greatest, and 7*m.* after it ought to have emerged from the shadow. Here we have, as I contend, *conclusive* evidence that the co-efficient of T^2 in the moon's mean elongation is *much* less than Hansen supposes. If the whole error were due to this cause, it would amount to 2''·9; but we may well suppose that there was a considerable error also in the place of the perigee, and this may have produced a change in the time of opposition, either in the same direction as the change caused by the error in the acceleration or in the opposite direction. In the former case, a less error than 2''·9 would suffice; in the latter, we must admit a greater error than this.

51. Having made these preliminary observations, I now proceed to speak of the eclipse of —944 April 4. The tables of Hansen do not extend beyond —800; but by the formulæ given in the preface, I have calculated the moon's place for this eclipse, and also that of the sun, on the supposition that the eccentricity was then ·017915, which is, I believe, what Hansen would make it to be. According to these data, the opposition of the sun and moon would take place on the 4th April —944 at 0*h.* 41·8*m.* G. M. T.; adding 2*h.* 5*m.* for difference of longitude, and subtracting 6·5*m.* for equation of time, the opposition would fall at 2*h.* 40*m.*, apparent time at Memphis, or about, as I calculate, 3*h.* 23*m.* before the moon would rise. The eclipse would continue 1*h.* 40*m.*, or thereabouts, after the opposition, so that it would be over, *according to Hansen*, 1*h.* 43*m.* before the moon rose. The question to be considered is—can we admit such an error in the tables, consistently with the record, as to the eclipse of 8th March —719, when the error was only 1*h.* 1*m.*? It must

certainly be acknowledged, that we cannot, if the mean longitude of the moon herself be the only thing in which the tables are at fault. In the eclipse of —719, an error of a second in the co-efficient of T^2 in the moon's mean longitude would produce an error of about 21*m.* 3*s.* in the time of opposition; while in that of —944, it would only produce an error of 22*m.* 57*s.*; so that 61*m.* in the former eclipse, which is the proved error of the tables, supposing the observation to be *accurate*, would correspond to an error of only 66·5*m.* in the latter. There may have been a slight error of observation in the eclipse of —719; the middle of the eclipse may not have been reached for some 5*m.* after apparent midnight; but about 72*m.* is the outside that can be allowed for the error in —944, corresponding to the observed error in —719. Let us suppose, however, that, as I suggested in § 50, there was an error in the place of the moon's perigee, which would retard the time of opposition by about 10*m.*, this would require that the error in the mean place of the moon, which is in the opposite direction, was greater than I have supposed. It will be convenient to assume the co-efficient of T^2 in the moon's mean elongation to be 8''·5. This supposes an error in the time of opposition of 77*m.* 43*s.*, which is about 11*m.* 43*s.* greater than the observation admits. Now, in the eclipse of —944, the error of 77*m.* 43*s.* would be increased to 84*m.* 44*s.*; while the error caused by the perigee would have its direction changed, the moon being in the opposite part of its orbit; and instead of being —11*m.* 43*s.*, would be + 11*m.* 7*s.*, so that an error of 96*m.* is admissible. The error of the tables should, however, as we have seen, be at least 103*m.*, supposing the observation to have been in the longitude of Memphis; but is it quite certain that it was so?

52. We know that Shishonk, the founder of the twenty-second dynasty, overran the kingdom of Judah; and we may naturally suppose that he retained some frontier fortress, which might serve as a point of support to the Egyptians in future wars. Any such fortress must be 14*m.* of time eastward of Memphis, and it might very well be 15*m.* The moon might have risen *there* 7 or 8*m.* before the termination of the eclipse; and for aught that we know to the contrary, the record may have referred to this point. Indeed, we have direct evidence that about the time of this eclipse, the king of Egypt was at the head of an army in Palestine. It is stated in 2 Chron. xiv. 9, that Zerah, the Ethiopian, who has been pretty generally identified by Egyptologists with Osorkon I., father of Takelut I., was defeated by king Asa at Marisha, about 15*m.* eastward of Memphis. In the following chapter, it is stated that after pur-

suings the invaders, and collecting an immense spoil, Asa effected a religious reformation, and gathered the people together at Jerusalem, in the third month of his fifteenth year. According to the canon of kings of Judah, as given in the Books of Kings, and as generally received by the early Christians (when corrected by eleven years, falsely inserted at the end of the canon to make up the seventy years' captivity, according to the misinterpreted prophecy), the first year of Asa was that which began in the spring of 959 B.C. (see § 16), and his fifteenth was that which began in the spring of 955 B.C., fifteen days after the eclipse. The assembly at Jerusalem was, in all probability, at the new moon, seventy-four days after the eclipse; and the interval between the battle and the assembly could not be much less, if at all less, than two months. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the eclipse happened when the king of Egypt was in Palestine, marching eastward, not many days before the battle; and if so, the eclipse must have been observed there. The record by no means implies that the eclipse was total. Possibly, it implies no more than that the moon was obscured, as it might be by the penumbra, just after it had emerged from the dark shadow; and if the moon rose, thus darkened, to the army in Palestine, it might appear worthy of notice, more especially when it was found that this phenomenon had not been seen in Egypt. Unfortunately, the text of the inscription at Karnak is in a very mutilated state, so that while the date and the record of the moon being obscured at that date are well preserved, the connexion in which this fact was recorded is wholly lost.

53. I now dismiss this discussion of the eclipse, which professed astronomers may take up if they like. I have considered it merely in a chronological point of view. I have, I think, shewn (as I sought to do) that there is no *absolute impossibility* in the eclipse of 4th April—944, having been observed as stated in the inscription of Takelut; its having been observed is not inconsistent with Ptolemy's record of the eclipse of 8th March—719, nor, I may add, with his record of that of 1 Sept.—719, nor with the record of the eclipse of Agathorles. All these records are consistent with the eclipse of —944, having been observed in Palestine. The only supposed records which I know to be inconsistent with it, are the pretended eclipse of Larissa and the eclipse of the Lydian war, if it were that of —585. Both of these records, however, I hold to be fanciful, and of no authority. The latter involves a decided anachronism. Now, there being no *absolute impossibility* in this eclipse having taken place as it is recorded that did, I contend that the record ought to be accepted as evidence that it did take place. It would in my

opinion be contrary to sound criticism to suppose that an obscuration of the moon, recorded to have been observed, did not really take place, or had some other cause than the earth's shadow.

54. I now come to the objection that is grounded on Lepsius's arrangement of the kings of the twenty-second dynasty. I admit that if, as Lepsius supposes, the Takelut under whose father the obscuration of the moon is said to have happened, were Takelut II., an eclipse could not have happened at the time indicated; but I maintain that Lepsius's arrangement is an arbitrary one, and is incorrect. In order that it may be seen in what respect my arrangement differs from his, I will give in the first place so much of the arrangement as I adopt.

First king.	Shishonk I. (Ra-hut-h'eper, sotep-en-Ra).
Second king, his son	Osorkon I. ?
Third king, his son	Takelut I. ?
Fourth king, his son	Osorkon II. ?
Fifth king	Shishonk II. (Ra-hut-h'eper, sotep-en-Amun).
Sixth king	Takelut II. ?
Seventh king	Shishonk III. (Ra-t'user-mâ, sotep-en-Ra).
Eighth king	Pemai (Ra-t'user-mâ, sotep-en-Amun).
Ninth king, his son	Shishonk IV. (Ra-âa-h'eper).

Four kings are known by direct monumental evidence to be sons of their predecessors; Lepsius supposes that all were so; and I am disposed to agree with him. Twelve generations, averaging twenty-four years, would bring us from Shishonk I., born about 1029 B.C., down to Seti III., born about 741 B.C. The age of Shishonk I. at his accession may be estimated pretty closely. He was not too old to make a warlike expedition in his sixth year, and to reign for twenty-one years; and yet he was sufficiently old to have a son grown to man's estate, to whom he preferred giving the daughter of Psusennes in marriage, to marrying her himself. We cannot suppose him to have been much over or under fifty. Possibly he was somewhat older, as he had a son older than Osorkon, who died before his father.

55. Now, the question at issue between Lepsius and his followers and me relates to the throne name of the two Osorkons and the two Takeluts. There is a representation of a king accompanied by a prince, his son, at Karnak (Leps., *Auswahl*, 15), who is certainly the same Takelut in whose reign the inscription recording the eclipse is dated, because he has the same throne name Ra-hut-h'eper, sotep-en-Ra. The question at issue is,—Was this Takelut I. or II.? The inscription speaks of the prince (who was dead, and apparently not long dead, when the inscription is dated, the eleventh year of Takelut, first of Tobî), as “first prophet of Amun (with other titles): Osorkon deceased,

born of the king's principal wife Karamama-merit-Mût (may she live!), daughter of the first prophet of Amun (with other titles) Namerut, royal son of Osorkon, son of Bast (may he live!)" Takelut himself is called son of Hîsit: and in another inscription in the same plate of the *Auswahl*, that from the Nile statue in the British Museum, Osorkon I. is named without any such designation as son of a goddess. It is by the contents of these two inscriptions that the question is mainly to be decided. Lepsius and I each draw a conclusion which would settle the question at issue, if the premise which we respectively assume were true: but I deny the truth of his; and he would probably deny the truth of mine, which he does not notice. Other arguments only tend to shew that one hypothesis is more probable than the other; but these two lead to a certain conclusion. Of course, one at least of the premises adduced by Lepsius and me must be false.

56. Lepsius assumes that the addition to a family name of Sa-Hîsit, Sa-Bast or Sa-Nîit, *i.e.*, "son of Isis, Bast or Nîth," was made with a view to distinguish the king so designated from a previous king who bore the same family name. Granting this to be the case, the Takelut and Osorkon of this inscription must be respectively the second of their name: I meet this argument by denying the truth of the proposition assumed by Lepsius. He admits himself, that the title which he supposes to be distinctive is often omitted, and that the names of the two goddesses are indiscriminately used. All that he can rest on is, then, the supposed fact that this addition is never made to the first king with any family name. It is curious, however, that he has himself furnished evidence contradicting this assertion. In the *Königsbuch*, No. 576, he gives the family name of Takelut I., with the addition "son of Isis." This is taken, I believe, from some leathern fragments at Berlin. Here, then, is an instance, given by himself, in which the two kings who alone bore the family name of Takelut are alike called "son of Isis" in their family name; the two different throne names accompanying the very same family name. Again, in the twenty-sixth dynasty, Ahmôis is always called son of Nîit; and I can scarcely think that this was to distinguish him from a king who reigned about a thousand years before him. I also find the same addition to the name of Psamitik I. (Sharpe, *i.*, 114.) In this plate we have the funeral vases of a general named Wah-het-Phrâ em k'u (or em tiou-en-Ra, as it was formerly read), whose name implies, as I conceive, that he was born when the Pharaoh, or Sun-god, so distinguished, whom we know to have been Psamitik I., was setting in glory. Now, the father of this general, whose

funeral vases are in the Louvre, is called Psamitik-sa-nît; and it is a matter of necessity that it was Psamitik I., after whom he was called; and consequently that king must have borne this title. It may occur to some that the younger general was called after Apries, in which case the elder might have been called after Psamitik II.; but in the first place, the family name of a king (which Wah-het-Phrâ was of Apries), was never used in this connexion; and in the second place, the death of Apries was of such a nature that we cannot suppose it possible that a young courtier should give his name to his son, commemorating a dethroned and murdered king, as if he had died in honour after a prosperous reign. No name could have been more appropriate than this for one who was born in 609 B.C., and it would have been hard to select one less so for a person who was born about 569 B.C. Nor again is it at all likely that if a courtier at the last date should have been foolish enough to give his son this name, both he and his son would have been successively advanced by Ahmôs to the rank of general. From all that has been said, I feel fully convinced that the designation of a king as son of a goddess was purely honorary, and by no means intended to distinguish him from a previous king of the same family name.

57. The general principle which I assume is, that the addition of "May he live!" to a king's name implies that he is alive. If so, Osorkon, mentioned in this inscription, must be the father, and not the grandfather of Takelut; and, of course, the Takelut here named must be the first of the name. In order to disprove this it would be necessary to produce an instance in which this addition is made to the name of a deceased king; but I contend that, even if such an instance could be adduced, though this conclusion would not necessarily follow, it would be highly probable that it was true. The only instances in which I have *seen* this addition made to a king's name, where his being alive was doubtful, are a tablet of the reign of Amen-em-hê II., already referred to, where the fact of the king so qualified being alive appears to me certain; the present inscription, where it is not impossible, for Osorkon, had he lived, could not be above eighty years old at the outside; and the inscription on the Nile statue, where Psusennes, the last king of the twenty-first dynasty, whose daughter was married to Osorkon I., is thus qualified. This inscription may very well have been made in the third or fourth year of Osorkon I., the twenty-fourth or twenty-fifth of the twenty-second dynasty; and there is no improbability in Psusennes having survived his dethronement twenty-five years, if he had been allowed to die a natural death. I have

seen no other inscription where the phrase occurs, and where there is any ground for doubting that the king was alive. I have read, however, of one of the Apis stèles, in which, if the statement be correctly given, there is a clear instance of the addition being made to the name of a dead king. I allude to the stèle of the twenty-eighth year of Shishonk III., in which this addition is said to be made to the name of a king Osorkon, who, whether he be first or second, must have been long dead.

58. It is safest, under these circumstances, to consider what is *probable*, assuming for argument's sake that there is no such certainty to be had, as I have been speaking of. In the first place, we have some sort of evidence from the Apis tombs. Mariette gives as successive Apises those who died in the twenty-third of Osorkon II., the fourteenth of Takelut I., and the twenty-eighth of Shishonk III. According to Lepsius, his Takelut I. should be II., whereas, according to my views, his Osorkon II. should be I. According to this view, we must suppose that several Apises intervened between the second and third of the above three; while, according to Lepsius, only one could have done so. It seems improbable, however, that we should here have the complete series; and if there be a gap for one, it may have included several. According to Africanus, Takelut II. only reigned thirteen years; but as the duration of the dynasty was shortened from 202 to 120 years, it is likely enough that both the fifteen years of Osorkon and the thirteen of Takelut are too small. I suspect the true numbers were twenty-five and twenty-three. At any rate it is improbable that no Apis should have been buried in the reign of Shishonk III., till his twenty-eighth year. While, then, I admit that the Apis monuments render Lepsius's theory rather more probable than mine, I think that the probability in favour of mine, derived from the argument in the preceding §, very nearly, if not altogether, counterbalances this.

59. The question is then to be decided, as it appears to me, by fitting the several personages mentioned in the inscriptions as connected with the royal family into their places, in the outline already given, and seeing which can be made to fit there in best accordance with the known length of generations. I will give a list of the persons mentioned who have to be placed, with what I suppose to have been their parentages and the approximate times of their births and deaths, and the leading events of their lives. All the dates are B.C. I omit unimportant personages.

1. Shishonk I., b. about 1029, became king 980, took Jerusalem 975, d. 959.
2. Osorkon I., b. about 1005, married daughter of Psusennes in 980, by whom he had two sons, 3 and 5; became king 959; invaded Judæa in 945; reigned alone till 934 [may have lived 10 years or so longer, his son 7 being king.]

3. Namerut, first prophet of Amun, heir of the twenty-first dynasty through his mother; b.c. 979, died soon after his father's becoming king.
4. Karamama, daughter of 3, heiress of the twenty-first dynasty; b. about 959, and was married to her uncle, Takelut I., about 944.
5. Shishonk, born c. 977; became first prophet of Amun on the death of his brother; erected the Nile statue soon after; died before 934.
6. Osorkon (of the Denon papyrus), prophet of Amun, son of 5, born c. 955; died before 934, after his father, but before his grandfather. He was probably murdered.
7. Takelut I., son of 2 by Tamentah'onsu, as Lepsius reads her name, b. about 981; became first prophet of Amun on the death of 5, to the prejudice of the hereditary rights of 6; in 934 became king [alone, or in conjunction with his father]; reigned till 919 at least.
8. Osorkon, son of 7 and 4, born c. 943; was first prophet of Amun, but died in his father's life-time about 924.
9. Osorkon II., son of 7, and a wife, whose name ends in —pes;—the former part has not yet been read,—born c. 957.
10. Shishonk II., son of 9, born c. 933; d. c. 889 or 899.
11. Takelut II., son of 10, born c. 909; reigned c. 889 or 899; d. c. 876.
12. Shishonk III., son of 11, born c. 885; reigned c. 876. Apis died 849; he died c. 824.
13. Shishonk, son of 2, and Karamat, Sam of Phthah, chief priest at Memphis, born c. 970; presided at the burial of an Apis in 937.
14. Takelut, son of 13, was born c. 910, and succeeded his father in all his offices.
15. T'esbast-peru, daughter of 9, and Hisit-em-H'eb, born c. 925.
16. Pet-Hisit, son of 14 and 15, born c. 900, succeeded his father in all his offices. He presided at the burial of an Apis in 851, and was living twenty-six years after, when the next Apis was buried; he was then aged about 75, and had grandchildren grown up.

I need not treat of the descent of Har-pe-son, as it presents no difficulty. He assisted at the burial of an Apis in or about 779, being the sixth in descent from Osorkon II., who was born c. 957. We may suppose him to have been thirty-four years old, and we should have about twenty-four years on an average for a generation.

If any one can point out a flaw in the above arrangement, I will readily acknowledge my error; but at present it appears to me perfectly satisfactory, both as respects monumental evidence, and as respects the ordinary course of human life.

60. I must, however, beg my readers to recollect, that if this arrangement of the dynasty be shewn to be inconsistent with the monuments, or if the grounds on which I have maintained that it was possible for an eclipse to have been seen by the Egyptians in 945 should be proved to be untenable, my restoration of Manetho is not affected by it. I bring forward this eclipse as a confirmation of conclusions at which I have arrived, independently of it. I argue, that as it is almost certain that an eclipse is monumentally recorded to have happened on a specified day, we ought to admit the record to be true unless there be a *certainty*, arising either from astronomical data or from monumental evidence, that the eclipse which appears to be recorded *could not*

have taken place. *Probability* will not do, because the probability that the monumental record was true would outweigh almost any probability that could conflict with it. And be it remembered that if it be proved that the record was *untrue*, its error must be in the *fact* that an eclipse occurred at all; some atmospheric phenomenon may *possibly* (though, I think, *most improbably*) have been mistaken for it: it cannot be in the date; for it is quite certain that, whether what is recorded happened in 945 or not, it could not have happened in any other year. If my eclipse is a good record, my arrangement of the dynasties is verified in the most remarkable manner. If I fail, there is no monumental eclipse at all, and my arrangement is neither verified nor disproved.

61. It is otherwise with the third of the synchronism, which I proposed to consider,—that of the rising of Sothis on the 28th Eipti. It must have risen on that day in four successive years, and there could be no mistake in the observation of the fact. It is certain, too, that the record of the rising on this day belongs to the reign of Thothmô's III. Consequently,—unless we suppose that an Egyptian sculptor inscribed the stone through mistake with a false date; which it is inconceivable that he should do, the stone having been fixed up in a public place, where an error, if it existed, must have been at once observed, and would of course have been immediately corrected,—*consequently*, I say, Thothmô's III. *must* have reigned in the fifteenth century B.C., when only this phenomenon could have occurred. According to my chronology, he would have done so; but not according to Lepsius, Bunsen, and most other Egyptologists.

With this observation I will conclude what I have to say, as respects the dynasties; and unless my system, so far as I have yet exhibited it, shall be proved to be unsound in the interim, I will, D.V., give the dates of the commencement of most of the reigns in the July number of this Journal.

EDWARD HINCKS.

Killyleagh, 29th Nov., 1862.